CRITICAL REMARKS

ON

THE HEBREW SCRIPTURES:

CORRESPONDING WITH

A NEW TRANSLATION OF THE BIBLE.

BY

THE REV. ALEXANDER GEDDES, LL. D.

VOLUME I.

CONTAINING

REMARKS ON THE PENTATEUCH.

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR THE AUTHOR BY DAVIS, WILKS, AND TAYLOR:

AND SOLD BY R. FAULDER, NEW BOND-STREET; AND J. JOHNSON, ST. PAUL'S CHURCH-YARD.

MDCCC.

BRITISH MUSEUM

1
8 69 9

THE HEBREW SCRIPTURES:

ON

CRITICAL REMARKS

TO THE READER.

IT was once my intention to prefix to this volume of CRITICAL REMARKS a DISSERTATION on Biblical, or, as it is commonly called, Sacred Criticiſm; and to conclude with a methodical DIGEST of the Laws of Moſes, compared with thoſe of other nations: but the Remarks themſelves have ſwelled to ſo great a ſize, that I have been under a ſort of neceſſity to drop, for the preſent, both thoſe projects; and reſerve them for ſome other, perhaps more apt, occaſion.

THE otherwiſe exuberant bulk of the volume has been principally owing to my having, at the requeſt of many of my ſubſcribers, been obliged to adopt a larger typographical character than that in which my SPECIMENS were printed; and which was, indeed, too minute and cloſe for the eyes of moſt readers. I have, therefore, exchanged it for that of my PREFACES; and am happy to find that this alteration meets the wiſh of all who have ſeen the printed ſheets.

IN truth, no coſt nor pains have been ſpared to make the page as uniformly elegant as poſſible; and it is preſumed, that few better printed books have, in latter times, iſſued from the preſs. Appropriate Greek and Hebrew types have induſtriouſly been adjuſted to the Engliſh; and, for the ſame purpoſe, the numerous quotations from the Samaritan, Syriac, Arabic, and Perſic languages have been printed in Hebrew letters. This, perhaps, will by ſome be accounted an imperfection; and, I confeſs, it was not without reluctance that I ultimately reſolved on ſuch a method. The following reaſons got the better of that reluctance:

FIRST, it would have been no eaſy matter to find, even in this great metropolis, ſets of Samaritan, Syriac, and Arabic characters in any degree ſuitable to the face of either our Roman or Italic letters: and if ſuch could have readily been found, it would have been extremely difficult to find a compoſitor capable of putting them together; without an attention and trouble, on my part, hardly to be conceived.

SECONDLY, I conſidered, that there are many Biblical Hebrew ſcholars but little acquainted with the other Eaſtern dialects; who yet might wiſh to ſee the analogy which theſe bear to the Hebrew, and to one another: to ſuch, I apprehend, it will be more agreeable to find my quotations from thoſe dialects preſented in Hebrew characters; while the thorough Orientaliſt will thereby loſe nothing, as he can, in idea, moſt readily ſubſtitute the Samaritan, Syriac, and Arabic ſigns.

THE Hebrew and the Chaldee are univerſally printed in the ſame characters; nor has any the ſmalleſt inconvenience hence ariſen: yet the Chaldee dialect differs as much from the Hebrew as the Syriac or Samaritan.—The Samaritan copy of the Pentateuch in Houbigant's and Kennicott's editions of the Hebrew Bible, without being leſs complete, is more eaſily and expeditiouſly compared with the Maſoretic text, than that in the Paris and London Polyglotts: and the Syriac New Teſtament in the editions of Plantin and Boderianus is to the learner, who has only a previous knowledge of Hebrew, not leſs uſeful, and much more pleaſant, than in the editions of Widmanſtad and Schaaf.

ALL this, I believe, will be readily granted; as the Samaritan and Syriac alphabets have exactly the ſame number of letters with the Hebrew and Chaldee alphabet: but how, it may be aſked, can the Arabic and Perſic alphabets (the former of which conſiſts of 28 letters, the latter of 32) be reduced to 22 Hebrew characters? I anſwer, Moſt eaſily: the Arabic alphabet, latterly adopted by the Perſians, had at firſt no more letters than the Hebrew and Syriac alphabets, and was arranged in the ſame order. At preſent it has fewer ſymbols, independent of its diacritic points; and, even with theſe, it has not ſo many vocal powers as the Hebrew alphabet. This latter has a double *beth*, a double *ghimel*, a double *daleth*, a double *chaph*, a double *phé*, a double *ſhin*, and a double *thau*, not to mention the various powers of the *matres lectionis* א, ה, ו, י; which would conſiderably increaſe the number.

IN fact, every alphabet, at firſt, muſt have had juſt as many letters as were neceſſary to denote the ſounds of the language for which it was framed. But language, in proceſs of time, and from various cauſes, acquires novel ſounds; and either theſe muſt be expreſſed by new ſymbols, or a new power given to thoſe already in uſe*. The Arabs followed this latter method. They contented themſelves with the ſmall number of 22 primitive elements†, which they borrowed from the Syrians; but as they had more ſounds to expreſs than thoſe elements could denote, they gave to moſt of them a double power, by adding certain arbitrary marks either above or below the letter; by Grammarians called *diacritic points*. If, then, theſe diacritic points, or others equivalent, can be equally well adjuſted to Hebrew characters, there is no reaſon why Hebrew characters may not be employed in writing and printing Arabic, and conſequently Perſic. Nor is this at all a new device. The whole Arabic Pentateuch was firſt printed, at Conſtantinople, in Hebrew letters; and in Schindler's Pentaglott, the Arabic words are throughout expreſſed in the ſame manner. I am not even ſure, but that the Arabs would have done better to adopt entirely the Hebrew alphabet, than to have formed the one which they uſe; in which the ſameneſs of certain characters is apt to beget confuſion, and has been the ſource of many miſtakes, through the careleſſneſs of tranſcribers in omitting or changing the diacritic marks of diſtinction. Beſides, in uſing the Hebrew characters, fewer diacritic marks are needful. There is no need of diſcriminating ב from כ, נ, or ת; nor theſe from one another. There is no need of diſcriminating ג from ח, nor ס from ש, nor פ from ק, nor ד from ר. Only ſix letters in Arabic, and ten in Perſic, require to be diſtinguiſhed, when printed in Hebrew characters: whereas in the Perſic and Arabic alphabets there are not leſs than 14 diacritic marks neceſſary in the latter, and 19 in the former.—I have therefore only to inform my readers what diſcriminating marks I have uſed in this work. A ſingle point over certain letters performs the whole office. The Arabic *dſhal* and the Perſic *dal* are repreſented thus ד; the Arabic *cha* and the Perſic *che* thus ח; the Arabic *da* and the Perſic *ſa* thus ס; the Arabic and Perſic *gain* thus ע; the Arabic *dad* and the Perſic *zad* thus צ; the Perſic *pe* is marked thus פ, the *zhe* thus ژ, *gaf* thus ג; and the Arabic *thſe* and the Perſic *te* thus ת.

IT remains to give ſome account of the nature of the volume which I now offer to the public. In my tranſlation and explanatory notes I have made it a rule to confine myſelf to the limited province of a mere interpreter; endeavouring to give a faithful verſion of my corrected originals, without comment or criticiſm. In the following remarks I have taken a wider and bolder range: I have throughout acted the critic, and occaſionally the commentator; although the office of the latter has always been made ſubſervient to that of the former. In both theſe characters I have freely uſed mine own judgment (ſuch as it is) without the ſmalleſt deference to inveterate prejudice or domineering authority. The Hebrew ſcriptures I

* This may be illuſtrated by our own alphabet, which we had from the Romans. It then conſiſted of only 23 elements; but now it conſiſts of at leaſt 30; without including the various powers of our vowels. And it is remarkable that, in this augmentation of our alphabet, we have partly followed the one and partly the other of the methods above mentioned. We have invented new ſymbols for *i* and *u* become conſonants: but have to *c*, *f*, *g*, *ſ*, *y*, and *z*, aſſigned a double ſound, without changing the name or figure; which is a real defect, not only in our, but in moſt modern alphabets. How a child is puzzled, when he is this moment told that *ca* is *ka*; in the next that *ce* is *ſe*; that *ga* is *gha*, but that *ge* is *je*!

† Strictly ſpeaking, the modern Arabic alphabet has but 16 characters: as its *be*, *ie*, *nun*, and *te*, have but one form; and ſo have its *kuph* and *phe*, and its *ze* and *re*, although their powers be totally different

have

have examined and appretiated, as I would any other writings of antiquity; and have bluntly and honeſtly delivered my ſentiments of their merit or demerit, their beauties or imperfections; as becomes a free and impartial examiner.—I am well aware, that this freedom will, by the many, be conſidered as an audacious licence; and the cry of *hereſy! infidelity! irreligion!* will reſound from ſhore to ſhore. But my peaceful mind has been long prepared for, and indeed accuſtomed to, ſuch harſh Cerberean barkings: and experience has made me (not naturally inſenſible) callous to every injury, that ignorance or malice may have in ſtore for me.

I ONLY enter my proteſt againſt downright miſrepreſentation and calumny. I diſclaim and ſpurn the imputation of irreligion and infidelity. I believe as much as I find ſufficient motives of credibility for believing: and without ſufficient motives of credibility, there can be no rational belief. Indeed, the great maſs of mankind have no rational belief. The vulgar Papiſt and the vulgar Proteſtant are here on almoſt equal terms: few, very few of either claſs ever think of ſeriouſly examining the primary foundations of their faith.

THE vulgar Papiſt reſts his on the ſuppoſed infallibility of his church; although he knows not where that infallibility is lodged, nor in what it properly conſiſts: it is to him a general, vague, indefinite idea, which he never thinks of analyſing. He reads in his catechiſm, or is told by his catechiſt, that *the church cannot err in what ſhe teaches*; and then he is told, that this unerring church is compoſed only of thoſe who hold communion with the biſhop of Rome, and preciſely believe as he, and the biſhops who are in communion with him, believe. From that moment reaſon is ſet aſide; authority uſurps its place, and implicit faith is the neceſſary conſequence. He dares not even advance to the firſt ſtep of Des Cartes's logic; he dares not doubt: for in his table of ſins, which he is obliged to confeſs, he finds *doubting in matters of faith* to be a grievous crime.

BUT, on the other hand, is the faith of the vulgar Proteſtant better founded? He reſts it on a book, called the Holy Bible, which he believes to be the infallible word of God. Is it by reading the Bible, and unbiaſſedly examining its contents, that he is led to this precious diſcovery? No: he is taught to believe the Bible to be the infallible word of God, before he has read, or can read it; and ſits down to read it with this prepoſſeſſion in his mind, that he is reading the infallible word of God. His belief, then, is as implicit as that of the vulgar Papiſt; and his motives of believing even leſs ſpecious. Both give up their reaſon, before they are capable of reaſoning; the one on the authority of his parents, or of his prieſt; the other on the authority of his parents, or of his parſon: but the prieſt urges his plea with more dexterity, and with a fairer outſide ſhow of probability. If the parſon be aſked how he himſelf knows that the book which he puts into the hand of his catechumen is the infallible word of God; he cannot, like the prieſt, appeal to an unerring church; he acknowledges no ſuch guide: and yet it is hard to conceive what other better argument he can uſe. If he ſay, that the book manifeſts its infallibility by its own intrinſic worth, he begs the queſtion. If he affirm, that he knows it to be infallible by the workings of the Holy Spirit in his heart, he plays the enthuſiaſt; and *his* enthuſiaſm can be no rational motive of credibility for any *other* individual, who feels not the like operations of the ſame Spirit. Twenty other difficulties ſurround his hypotheſis, which it certainly is not eaſy to remove; and the beſt ſolutions he can give, are but gilded ſophiſms.—On reading the *popiſh controverſy*, as it is called, from the days of Elizabeth to the preſent day, one is apt, at leaſt I am apt, to think, that the Romaniſts had, on this point, the better ſide of the queſtion; by ſome of their controverſialiſts not improperly called the *queſtion of queſtions*.—Yet this ſame queſtion of queſtions has never been ſatisfactorily ſolved by the Romaniſts themſelves. They always reaſoned in what is termed a *vicious circle*; and proved the infallibility of the church from the authority of ſcripture, and the authority of ſcripture from the church's infallibility. I know what ſhifts have been made by Bellarmine, Becan, and many others, to get out of this coil; but I have never met with any one who had ſucceeded.

ON the whole then, I think, it may be laid down as an axiom, that the bulk of Chriſtians, whether Papiſts or Proteſtants, cannot be ſaid to have a rational faith; becauſe their motives of credibility are not rational motives; but the poſitive aſſertions of an aſſumed authority, which they have never diſcuſſed, or durſt not queſtion: their religion is the fruit of unenlightened credulity. A very ſmall number, of

curious

curious and learned men only, have thoroughly examined the motives of their religious belief, in any communion: and it will be found, I preſume, that the more curious and learned they were, the leſs they generally believed. Hence, perhaps, the old adage: *Ignorance is the mother of devotion.*

WITHOUT ranking myſelf with the *learned*, I may ſafely claſs myſelf with the *curious*. I have been at great pains to examine every ſyſtem of theology, that has come in my way, in order to fix my religious belief on ſomething like a ſure foundation. I have ſearched the ſcriptures; I have ſtudied tradition; I have read eccleſiaſtical hiſtory: and the reſult of my ſearch, my ſtudy, and my reading has been, that reaſon, reaſon only is the ultimate and only ſure motive of credibility; the only ſolid pillar of faith.

I CANNOT, then, be charged with *infidelity*, ſince I firmly believe all that reaſon tells me I ought to believe: nor can I be charged with *irreligion*; becauſe I am conſcious that Religion, genuine Religion, is both reaſonable, and conducive to human happineſs. So far from wiſhing to hurt the intereſts of this Religion, I have the moſt ardent deſire to promote her injured cauſe; to exhibit her in her native, divine charms; diveſted of every vain and uſeleſs trapping, and tinſel decoration, in which the buſy hand of ſuperſtition hath officiouſly attired her: and, at the ſame time, to reſcue her, if poſſible, from the ſacrilegious fangs of gloomy fanaticiſm, that would clothe her in the ſable weeds of forbidding auſterity; and expoſe her as a haggard ſcare-crow, to deter the liberal and generous part of mankind from her ſweet embrace.

THE goſpel of JESUS is my religious code: his doctrines are my deareſt delight: "his yoke (to me) is eaſy, and his burden is light:" but this yoke I would not put on; theſe doctrines I could not admire; that goſpel I would not make my law, if Reaſon, pure Reaſon, were not my prompter and preceptreſs. I willingly profeſs myſelf a ſincere, though unworthy diſciple of Chriſt: *Chriſtian* is my name, and *Catholic* my ſurname. Rather than renounce theſe glorious titles, I would ſhed my blood: but I would not ſhed a drop of it for what is neither Catholic nor Chriſtian. Catholic Chriſtianity I revere wherever I find it, and in whatſoever ſect it dwells: but I cannot revere the loads of hay and ſtubble which have been blended with its precious gems; and which ſtill in every ſect, with which I am acquainted, more or leſs tarniſh or hide their luſtre. I cannot revere metaphyſical unintelligible creeds, nor blaſphemous confeſſions of faith. I cannot revere perſecution for the ſake of conſcience, nor tribunals that enforce orthodoxy by fire and faggot.—I cannot revere formulas of faith made the teſt of loyalty, nor penal laws made the hedge of church-eſtabliſhments. In ſhort, I cannot revere any ſyſtem of religion, that, for divine doctrines, teacheth the dictates of men; and by the baſe intermixture of "human traditions maketh the commandments of God of none effect." This I ſay even of Chriſtian ſyſtems: and ſhall I grant to ſyſtematic Judaiſm what I deny to ſyſtematic Chriſtianiſm? Shall I diſbelieve the pretended miracles, the ſpurious deeds, the forged charters, the lying legends of the one, and give full credit to thoſe of the other? May I, blameleſs, examine the works of the Chriſtian doctors and hiſtorians by the common rules of criticiſm, explode their ſophiſtry, combat their raſh aſſertions, arraign them of credulity, and even ſometimes queſtion their veracity; and yet be obliged to conſider every fragment of Hebrew ſcripture, for a ſeries of 1000 years, from Moſes to Malachi; every ſcrap of prophecy, poeſy, minſtrelſy, hiſtory, biography, as the infallible communications of heaven, oracles of divine truth? Truly, this is to require too much from credulity itſelf.

IN the Hebrew ſcriptures are many beauties, many excellent precepts, much ſound morality: and they deſerve the attentive peruſal of every ſcholar, every perſon of curioſity and taſte. All thoſe good things I admit, and admire, and would equally admire them in the writings of Plato, Tully, or Marcus Antoninus: but there are other things, in great abundance, which I can neither admire nor admit; without renouncing common ſenſe, and ſuperſeding reaſon: a ſacrifice which I am not diſpoſed to make, for any writing in the world.

THIS language will, I doubt not, ſeem ſtrange to the ſyſtematic Chriſtian, who has founded his creed, not upon reaſon or common ſenſe, but on the prejudices of education; who is a Papiſt at Rome, a Lutheran at Leipſic, and a Calviniſt at Geneva; a Prelatiſt in England, and a Preſbyterian in Scotland; a Neſtorian

a Neſtorian in Syria, in Armenia an Eutychian—for ſuch local nominal Chriſtians my Remarks were not intended: they would ſpurn them with zealous indignation. But if there be, as I truſt there are, in each of thoſe communions, men who have learned to think for themſelves, in matters of faith as well as in matters of philoſophy, and who are not Chriſtians merely becauſe they were born of Chriſtian parents, and bred up in Chriſtian principles; but becauſe, on the moſt ſerious and mature examination, they find Chriſtianity a rational, a moſt rational religion—to ſuch I addreſs myſelf with confidence; and by ſuch I expect to be liſtened to with patient candour.

To ſuch I would ſay: It is time, it is full time, that Chriſtianity ſhould learn to walk alone, without Jewiſh leading-ſtrings or Gentile go-carts. It is time, that the pure ſpiritual religion of Jesus ſhould throw aſide all the taudry cumberſome load of exotic ornaments, borrowed either from Judaiſm or Paganiſm, from the temple of Jeruſalem or the temples of Jupiter; and reclothe herſelf in the white ſpotleſs robes, in which ſhe was originally inveſted.—It is time for her rational admirers to vindicate her chaſte character from the aſperſions of her profeſſed enemies, and from the falſe praiſe of her pretended friends: for the falſe praiſe of her pretended friends has been often more injurious to her reputation, than the obloquy of her profeſſed enemies: or, rather, ſhe has had no enemies; but becauſe her pretended friends have exhibited her in a dreſs which ſhe diſclaims and deſpiſes. Strip her at once of this ungainly meretricious garb; reſtore her to her primitive ſimplicity; and ſhe will need only to be ſeen, to be admired, loved, idolized!—Her charms have made me warm in her cauſe:—but I muſt ſtop the rapidity of my pen; and fall gently back to my more immediate ſubject.

It will be expected, perhaps; nay, it has been ſuggeſted, by ſome of my well-wiſhers, that I ſhould here take ſome notice of the various *cenſures* (for I cannot call them *critiques*), that, in the courſe of ſix or ſeven years, have been made on the two volumes of my Tranſlation already publiſhed. For the preſent, I beg to be excuſed, as I really think I can better employ my time, than in wantonly running my head againſt every poſt or wind-mill, which I may happen to meet. What, indeed, would they have me notice? The effuſions of ignorance or malignity? Moſt of my *Cenſurers* are anonymous ſcribblers, who inſidiouſly aim their ſhafts at me from behind a buſh; and on whom, were I even to detect them in their lurking-holes, I ſhould hardly waſte a penful of ink. Let them continue to throw their impotent darts, and ſcatter their innocent firebrands, as long as they pleaſe. I ſhall imitate an emperor, who, when he was told that the rabble had thrown dirt at his ſtatue, rubbed his face, and ſaid: "I feel it not."—The teethleſs cur may bark, and bark; but cannot inflict a deadly bite: the laſh of Jerom would be ill employed againſt ſuch a harmleſs animal.

I looked for criticiſm, I courted it: but I expected, vainly expected, that my critics would be liberal critics; would be gentlemen and ſcholars; ſcholars well verſed in Oriental learning, and perfectly acquainted with the ſubject of their critique. I expected that they would contraſt my verſion with the originals, and compare it with other tranſlations; point out where I had failed, and where I had ſucceeded; ſhown, if they could ſhow, that I had either miſunderſtood or miſinterpreted my author; produced examples from every ſpecies of Hebrew compoſition; and overturned my reaſonings by logical argumentation: how was I diſappointed to find nothing in their ſtrictures, but vague declamation and general invective! May they reſt in peace!

To my patient ſubſcribers an apology is due, for the too tardy appearance of this volume. Many things have contributed to this delay, which has given more pain to myſelf, than diſappointment to them. To enumerate the cauſes may be unneceſſary: as I truſt they will no more occur. Meaſures are taking to make the future volumes ſucceed one another, with as much diſpatch as the nature of the work will allow. The third volume of Tranſlation and the ſecond volume of Critical Remarks will, it is hoped, come out together in the courſe of next year.

I am ſorry to be obliged to raiſe the price of the volumes: but the riſe of the price of paper has been ſo great, that this was abſolutely unavoidable. After all, I am told by my Bookſellers, that the price is too ſmall; and conſidering the quantity of matter and the beauty of the page, it ought to have been two guineas.

guineas. Even at that price I am certain I ſhould not have pocketed a ſingle guinea: as it is, the profits will be leſs than nothing; unleſs a greater number be ſold than I expect. But my motive in writing was not to enrich myſelf; but, if poſſible, to enlighten my fellow creatures; and to eradicate their prejudices.—Even thoſe who will not be enlightened, nor quit their prejudices, ought to be thankful for the ſervice I have done—by illuſtrating many obſcure paſſages in the Hebrew writings, and giving a more faithful verſion of them, I preſume, than has yet appeared in Engliſh. Without adopting my ideas of *inſpiration*, *infallibility*, &c. they may profit of my labour; and, while they diſlike my principles, applaud my perſeverance.

For the ſake of ſuch conſcientious perſons it has been propoſed, that I ſhould give a ſmall edition of the Tranſlation alone; with as few explanatory notes as poſſible: and to this I have no objection but one—namely, that, without a pretty copious ſubſcription, I could not undertake ſo expenſive a ſecondary work. Five hundred names at leaſt would be neceſſary; with ſome ſmall advance for each volume. The firſt two volumes might be put to the preſs immediately, and the reſt printed at the ſame time with the larger work. The Old Teſtament might be compriſed in *five*, and the New Teſtament in two volumes. The price of each volume could not be leſs than half-a-guinea. If theſe propoſals be acceded to; a neat edition in twelves ſhall keep pace with that in quarto; and be finiſhed at the ſame time.

And now I conclude this ſhort Preface in the words of Manzotti:

Tu, *liber, interea, diverſa per oppida curre,*
Invidiam ſubiture gravem: nam multus ubique
Oblatrator erit, cujus lacerabere morſu.
Non deerunt certè, qui cum nil edere poſſint
Dignum laude, tamen gaudent maledicere ſemper;
Carpendis aliis famam venantur inanem.
Hos tu *lividulos catulos oriſque maligni*
Exoſus, refuge; et doctos inquire bonoſque;
Qui pauci ſunt—ſed paucis potes eſſe beatus.

Farewell.

CRITICAL

CRITICAL REMARKS.

GENESIS. CHAP. I.

Ver. 1. *IN the beginning* בראשית. This word, on which ſo much has been written, can refer only to one or other of two periods; either, proleptically, to the ſix days creation, or to ſome prior epoch. Thoſe who refer it to a prior epoch, render *Originally*. So the late Biſhop Law, in his manuſcript Notes; and ſo ſome German interpreters of the preſent day. Nay, the Chaldee paraphraſt Jonathan ſeems to have taken it in that ſenſe: for he renders it מן אולא *a principio*.

I would rather refer it to what follows; and if I were to paraphraſe the verſe, I would do it thus: "The firſt thing which GOD did, to make earth a ſuitable habitation for man, was to "give to it and to the heavens the reciprocal appearances which they now have. Before that "period, the earth was immerſed in water, and covered with thick darkneſs, &c. and with "reſpect to *it*, the *heavens* exiſted not; that is, all thoſe ethereal phenomena, which conſtitute "what we call *the heavens*, were yet inviſible."—Such a change, or revolution, might juſtly and properly be denominated a *Creation:* for the word ברא, which we render *created*, has been, without reaſon, conſidered as implying an abſolute creation out of nothing; as will be ſhewn in the next Remark but one.

It is hardly worth remarking, that Aquila tranſlates the Hebrew word בראשית by a Greek word, which, according to Baſil and Ambroſe, denotes rather the ſimultaneouſneſs than the time of the operation; as if he had meant to ſay, "GOD all at once, or, in a ſummary manner, "εν κεφαλιῳ (or κεφαλιδι) created, &c."—Aquila, moſt probably, dreamed of no ſuch refinement; but only adopted, according to his ſervile mode of tranſlating, a Greek term, which ſeemed to correſpond more literally with the Hebrew, than αρχη, which the more antient tranſlators had uſed, and which was retained by Theodotion and Symmachus.—He may, however, have had in his view a paſſage in Eccleſiaſticus xviii. 1. Ὁ ζων εις τον αιωνα εκτισε τα παντα KOINHι; which our tranſlators render: "He that liveth for ever, created all things "IN GENERAL." But ſee C. R. on that place.

Ib. *GOD* אלהים. After reading much, and thinking more, on this Hebrew word, I confeſs I am not entirely ſatisfied with any etymon that has yet preſented itſelf. In my explanatory Note, I have ſaid that, in its primitive ſignification, it denotes *ſtrength, power*, ισχυρος the *mighty one:* nor have I yet ſeen any very cogent reaſon to depart from this moſt antient and moſt generally received derivation. It is ſo natural to affix the idea of ſuperior power to the Deity, that it could hardly miſs entering into ſome one of his appellations. But let us try to analyſe the term.

The moſt ſimple form in which the Hebrew name of GOD appears is אל; and this has been ſuppoſed by lexicographers to be the ſame with איל, which unqueſtionably ſignifies *ſtrong, powerful.*—To this derivation, however, Michaelis formally objects, and even calls it a manifeſt blunder. His chief reaſon is, the difference of orthography; namely that, when the word ſignifies GOD it is uniformly written אל without a *jod*; but never ſo, when it ſignifies ſtrong. But this, I think, is a raſh aſſumption. From the collation of manuſcripts it is clear that the Jewiſh ſcribes did not always obſerve that rule. In Exod. 15. 11. where the printed Text, both in the SAM. and HEB. copies, has אלים, 6 SAM. and 2 HEB. MSS. have אילים. On the other hand, in v. 15 of the ſame ch. where the Text has אילי, 8 MSS. have אלי. In Ezek. 17. 13. the Text has אילי, and 2 MSS. have אלי; but in ch. 32. 21. where the Text has אלי, 23 MSS. have אילי.

From this I think it is ſufficiently clear, that the Hebrew ſcribes were apt to write the word both ways, eſpecially after the vowel-points came into general uſe: for then the *matres lectionis*, i. e. the real original vowels, were often dropped; more eſpecially the *vau* and *jod*: a *holem*, *ſhurek* or *kibutz* ſupplying the place of the former; and a *tſeré* or *hirik-katon* that of the latter.—Thus, with reſpect to *jod*, we find חיק and חק, חיל and חל, מיץ and מץ, שיש and שש.—A moſt ſtriking inſtance occurs in the word ריק. In Gen. 37. 24. the SAM. printed Text has the word full; but the HEB. with 5 SAM. MSS. have it defective. In Deut. 32. 4. both printed Texts have רק, but 4 SAM. MSS. have ריק. In Nehem. 5. 13. the Text has רק, but 4 MSS. have ריק.

Theſe examples I have brought to prove that the Maſoretic copyiſts, in writing words which have a *jod* in the middle, were by no means ſcrupulous about retaining or rejecting that genuine vowel, ſince they had a ſpurious vowel point to ſubſtitute in its room. There is then, in my apprehenſion, no ſufficient proof that אל and איל were not originally the ſame word; and, conſequently, our Gloſſariſts, who derive אלהים from איל, are not ſo much in the wrong as Michaelis would make us believe.—His objection drawn from the points is, with me, of no force; and indeed he lays little ſtreſs on it. Beſides, the punctuation itſelf varies: for we find איל pointed in all the following forms, אֵיל, אֶיל and אַיִל, which laſt is the punctuation of אֵל GOD.

But whence is it, then, ſays Michaelis, that the word is uniformly written and pointed אֵל, when it ſignifies GOD, and איל with the ſame, or other, points, when it denotes *power, ſtrength?* —I anſwer, firſt, The uniformity is not ſo certain, as we have juſt now ſeen. Secondly, ſuppoſing that uniformity, might not the firſt inventors of vowel-points, or the improvers on that invention, have purpoſely made ſuch a diſtinction? as they are ſuppoſed to have made a ſimilar one to diſtinguiſh אד a *vapour*, from אֵיד a *calamity*: although here, too, there is the ſame confuſion in different copies. For in the only two places, where the word is ſuppoſed to ſignify a *vapour*, namely, Gen. 2. 6. and Job 36. 7. three MSS. in the former place, and fifty in the latter, have איד. On the other hand, where it means *calamity*, which is thirty-two times, only in ſeven of theſe places is it without the various reading אד.

I repeat it then, there is no ſolid proof that אל and איל were not originally the ſame word.—But how is אלהים derived from that word? This is another queſtion, which next comes to be diſcuſſed. In order to which, it is firſt of all to be obſerved, that the word אלהים is here

in

in its plural form, the ſingular of which is אלוה. Now how is this אלוה derived from אל?—Three ſchemes of derivation have chiefly attracted my attention.

The firſt of theſe is, to make it a compound of אל and הוא *Potens-ille*; or, as we would ſay, The *mighty He*, κατ' εξοχην. What ſeems in ſome meaſure to confirm this etymon is, that in Pſ. 102. 28. GOD is deſigned without any other epithet ואתה הוא and THOU-HE: which the Greek tranſlator renders συ δε ὁ αυτος; and our common Verſion: "But thou *art* the ſame."—Hence among the *Kabaliſts* הוא is accounted one of the names of GOD. See Buxtorf. Lex. Chald. and Caſtell. Lex. Polyglott.*

It may, indeed, be objected, that to juſtify this etymon the pronoun הוא ſhould be written הוה—Perhaps ſo it was originally; but in proceſs of time changed into הוא to diſtinguiſh it from the verb. It is well known that the letters א and ה have often been interchanged, even without any change in the meaning. Neither the Syriac nor the Arabic have א at all in their reſpective pronouns, but either הו, or ו ſingle; which form the Chaldee ſometimes puts on: and in Hebrew the equivalent ſuffix is only ו as the equivalent prefix is only ה.—Beſides, it was not neceſſary, nor even uſual, in compounding words, to take in all the letters of each component part: more eſpecially in proper names. See Simonis's *Onomaſticon.*

A ſecond derivation, that would remove even the fore-mentioned objection, and which is not without plauſibility, is to compound it of אל and הוה *Potens-ens*, the *powerful being*; an appellation, which every one muſt allow to be perfectly ſuitable.

A third derivation is that of the learned Jew Abarbanel, latterly ſupported and illuſtrated by David Levi, in the firſt volume of his *Lingua Sacra.*—According to them, both אלהים and אלוה are ſingulars, and compounded of אל and two letters taken from the ſacred name יהוה: but the borrowed letters are not the ſame for both forms: אלוה borrows ו and ה, but אלהים and its conſtructive form אלהי borrow ה and י†.

This is ingenious enough; but I fear it will not bear the teſt of a ſevere rational critique.—For, in the firſt place, admitting this ſtrange mangling and diſmembering of the ſacred name יהוה, how came the profane letter מ to be tacked to the word? Oh! ſays Mr. Levi, the final ם is joined "to form the *abſolute*, אלהים, by which it is diſtinguiſhed from its *relative* אלהי."—Can he produce ſuch another inſtance from the whole body of Hebrew ſcriptures?

Granting then, that the termination ים is not always a proof that the word is a plural, (or, to ſpeak more properly, that a plural form may expreſs only a ſingle perſon or people, as אפרים, מצרים) this cannot be granted with regard to אלהים; which has not only every external mark and requiſite of a genuine plural; but muſt evidently be rendered ſo, both in *abſolute* and *relative* conſtruction, as often as it ſignifies more gods than one, or more than one great perſonage—Who then is authoriſed to make a grammatical diſtinction between אלהים when it denotes the true GOD, and אלהים when it denotes falſe gods? And is it not better to ſay,

* I cannot but here notice a miſtake in Caſtell. He ſays, that in the Arabic Verſion of Pſ. 99. 2. the Hebrew word אל is rendered הו *Ille*. But the Hebrew word is not אל but יהוה, and this is rendered not הו but אלרב. See c. R. on that place.

† For this the author gives myſtical reaſons, which I take no notice of: becauſe in biblical criticiſm I admit none. The curious reader, who chooſes to ſee them, may peruſe the long article אלה in the above mentioned volume.

with Aben-Ezrah and the run of Jewiſh commentators, that the plural, when applied to the one true GOD, is uſed "for honour's ſake, על דרך הכבוד, according to the idiom of the lan-"guage, מדרך הלשון:" and this I take to be the real caſe. See the concluſion of this Remark.

In the ſecond place, Abarbanel's etymon lies under another very great objection. If אלוה and אלהים comprehend in themſelves both אל and יהוה GOD and JEHOVAH; ſuch phraſes as יהוה אלהים and אלהים יהוה, the former of which frequently occurs, are mere tautologies.

"But (ſays Mr. Levi) if אלוה, אלהי and אלהים be all of the ſame root and ſignification, what "is the reaſon of the change, in the order that they are written; that is, אלהים and אלהי being "always written without a *vau*, and אלוה always with one?" Why, in my opinion it has ariſen from the mere caprice of orthographers, who have, in all ages and languages, made gradual alterations and real or pretended improvements in the manner of writing words, as well as of conſtructing phraſes. To inſtance only in our own language; what changes has not orthography undergone ſince the days of Elizabeth? How many letters which were deemed uſeleſs or ſuperfluous, have we not expunged? And no letter has been more frequently ſo, than the very letter that correſponds with the Hebrew *vau*, which has, by degrees, almoſt totally diſappeared from the numerous claſs of words that terminate in *our*.

But to return to אלוה, Mr. Levi allows that it is once at leaſt written without the *vau*, Deut. 32. 17. He ſhould have added Dan. 11. 38. and Habakuk 1. 11. I mean according to the common Text: for many MSS. in Dan. and one at leaſt in Hab. have the word full. Such is the diverſity and mutability of Hebrew orthography.—For the exception in Deut. Mr. Levi has at hand a myſtical reaſon; namely, becauſe there it is applied to falſe gods: but is it not ſo alſo in 2 Chron. 32. 15? Yet there the word is written *full*, with the exception of a ſingle MS.: which MS., according to Mr. Levi's myſticiſm, muſt be ſuppoſed to be the genuine reading.

The truth is, the ſingular of אלהים is rarely found in the Hebrew Scriptures, except in poetical compoſitions. In the whole Pentateuch it occurs but twice; and that in the Song of Moſes, Deut. 32. 15, 17. In the former of theſe verſes it is in the printed Text written *full*, but *defective* in 5 MSS. In the latter verſe the Text has it *defective*, but 23 MSS. have it *full*. In both places the SAM. Text hath אלה, without any variety of lection.—In the book of Job it occurs about forty times; and in ſixteen of theſe, there is a variety of reading either of one or of two MSS.—In the Pſalms it occurs, I think, but four times, and in each of theſe *one* or *two* MSS. have אלה.

Be theſe MSS. faulty or not, it is all one to me. I bring the examples only to ſhew how vague and uncertain is Hebrew orthography, with reſpect to the original vowels; owing chiefly to the ſubſtitution of vowel-points. For, let it be remarked, that in all thoſe inſtances the Maſoretes direct us to read the word in the ſame manner, by thruſting in a *holem* between the ל and the ה in the *defective* אלה; a plain proof of their being convinced that the *vau* originally belonged to it.

Come we now to אלהי, the *relative* form of אלהים. Mr. Levi grants, that, in the Pſalms, it is twice found with a *vau*; namely, Pſ. 143. 10. and 145. 1. He might have added Pſ. 18. 47. where the Text of Athias has אלוהי יעשי.

I have

I have neither time nor inclination to look for the myſtical "cauſes of this deviation from a "general rule, according to the order of the Maſora;" nor ſhall I avail myſelf of that deviation to combat Mr. Levi's ſyſtem: I will even lend him my aid, if he chooſe it, to get rid of the anomaly: for, in the firſt example 42 MSS. in the ſecond 52, and in the third not leſs than 59, have the *defective* אלהי.—Granting then, what is not ſtrictly true, that both אהלי and אלהים are uniformly and invariably written without a *vau*, and אלוה as uniformly with one; I can readily account for it, without having recourſe to the Maſora, or the myſtical reaſons of Mr. Levi.

It is extremely common with the Hebrew ſcribes to eliminate from plurals that letter, when it occurs in the middle of a word; as the reader may convince himſelf by turning to the participial forms of בנה, גלה, חוה, חלה, מרה, נשה, עלה, עשה, פעה, ראה, רעה, שנא.—To particularize in a few inſtances: The word חוזה a *ſeer*, is in the ſingular written ſometimes with, and ſometimes without the *vau*; but its plural חזי always without it. So, we find רואה and ראה, but never רואים nor רואי. So שונא and שנא, but never שונאים nor שונאי. In Buxtorf's Concordance, indeed, we find שונאיכם, and are referred to Levit. 26. 17. But this is a miſtake; for the Text of Athias has the word *defective*; nor is there any variety of reading in either Kennicott or De Roſſi. The word אנוש is never, I think, in the ſingular written without the *vau*; in the plural never with it. I know the vowel-points are changed, and vary: but that is nothing to the purpoſe; ſtill the *vau* has been eliminated.—The word אדון is never written without the *vau*, but its plural אדנים never with the *vau*: yet this too is one of the names of GOD.

In all theſe words, as well as in אלוה, the *vau* is what grammarians call a *ſervile* letter. I will now bring examples of eliſion of the ſame letter, even from the plurals of words in which it is *radical*.—The word יום a *day* occurs in the ſingular above 1300 times, but never once, I believe, without the *vau*: whereas its plurals ימים and ימי, which occur at leaſt 800 times, are always defective. The vowel-point is changed: but that, as I have obſerved on another occaſion, makes nothing againſt my argument; ſtill the radical *vau* is eliminated.—In like manner, we have דור and ſometimes דר in the ſingular; and twice דורים; but we never once find דורות; although that plural form occurs at leaſt forty times.—So תור a *turtle dove*, which in the ſingular is ſometimes written תר; but never תורים in the plural.

Not only the letter *vau*, but alſo the letter *jod*, has met with a ſimilar fate. The word עיר a *town*, which ſo very frequently occurs, is in the ſingular never written *defective*; but in the plural ſcarcely ever *full*.—So בית has בתים, ציץ צצים, &c.—In ſhort, ſuch was the propenſity of the Hebrew orthographiſts to thruſt out thoſe two vowels, that they made no ſcruple of ejecting them even from ſingulars, as well as plurals, juſt as it ſuited their fancy, or tickled their ear; ſupplying their place, either by a vowel-point of the ſame power, or one which they deemed more harmonious, or which perhaps a vicious pronunciation had introduced: as frequently happens in all languages.—The very lengthening of a word by the addition of a letter was deemed a ſufficient cauſe of eliſion. We have a ſingular inſtance in the word איש a *man*; which never once occurs defective: but its feminine אשה a *woman* is never once written *full*, that is, with a *jod* after *aleph*. So אויל a *fool*, is in the ſingular not once written without the *jod*. But let it be lengthened by the addition of the letters י or ת, it becomes אולי and אולת.

If

If any one, yet unconvinced, have a further deſire to ſee how vaguely variable, and unconfined to rule, is Hebrew orthography, let him take the trouble, with me, to obſerve the whole diverſity that appears in the ſingle word גדול *great*.—This word, in its moſt ſimple ſingular form, without *prefix* or *affix*, occurs about 170 times, and is only twice written defective, Deut. 26. 8. and Pſ. 57. 11. and, in the former of theſe places, the SAM. Text, and 29 HEB. MSS. read *full*: in the latter 57 MSS. have the word likewiſe *full*; ſo that, on the whole, גדול may be ſaid to be the abſolute, invariable reading. But when the ſame word is lengthened by the prefix ה, which is about ninety-nine times, the *vau* is wanting in ſixteen places; and all theſe are in the Pentateuch. It is true that even in theſe the SAM. uniformly, and in moſt of them many HEB. MSS. have הגדול; and this, I doubt not, is the genuine original reading: but I am now ſpeaking of the ſtrange variety in our preſent, pretendedly *pure* and *immaculate*, Text. —With the prefixes ב and ו there is no *defective* example; and only one with each of the prefixes כ * and מ; and in the laſt inſtance the word is ſtill more lengthened by the prefix *lamed*. It occurs in Eſther 1. 5. and although it be given *defective* in Buxtorf's Concordance †, it is, in the Text of Athias and of Bomberg, written *full*.

In the plural forms of גדול we meet with גדולים only eleven times, but with גדלים twenty-four times; the conjunctive form גדולי occurs but thrice, and only once *full*.

The foregoing examples are all in the maſculine.—The feminine גדולה, either with or without any *prefix*, occurs ninety-two times *full*, and twenty-eight times defective ‡: but its plural גדולות, which occurs thirty-eight times, is never *full* but once in Buxtorf; namely, Joſh. 24. 17. and even there the Text of Athias has it *defective*.—It may here be worth remarking that this ſame plural, like other plurals of a like form, is not unfrequently written doubly defective; that is, without a *vau* at all, גדלת; two officious *holems* ſupplying both defects.—Such was the propenſity of the Jewiſh ſcribes to eject the letter *vau*, that even the ſhort negative לוא, which occurs ſo very often, is, if we may truſt Bythner, found written *full* only thirty-five times in the whole Hebrew Scripture.

I have dwelled ſo long upon this ſubject, not ſo much for the purpoſe of conteſting Abarbanel's and Mr. Levi's derivation of the word אלהים; as to ſhew the biblical ſtudent, how little ſtreſs, in general, is to be laid on derivations and combinations, grounded upon the omiſſion or non-omiſſion of a letter; and, at the ſame time, to point out the abſurdity of myſtical Kabaliſm.—Were a Chriſtian Kabaliſt (and ſuch things are) to analyſe the name JESUS, or ישוע, after the ſame manner and with the ſame latitude, and find in it JEHOVAH-THE-SAVIOUR, I believe there is not a Jew who would not ſneer at the conceit. Mr. Levi then will pardon us, if we ſmile at his myſtical derivation of אלהים; and deem not, with him, the variety in writing the word "the effect of ſuperlative wiſdom."

A fourth compound derivation, which I ſhall juſt notice, is that of thoſe who compoſe it of אל and אים *The tremendous great one*: which, certainly, is no unſuitable epithet, and coincides

* But here, alſo, the SAM. and 27 MSS. have the word *full*.

† In Buxtorf there are numerous miſtakes of this ſort; and a new Hebrew Concordance is much wanted: but to make a good one would require much time and labour; with great critical abilities.

‡ Henceforward, I follow Buxtorf, without verifying the examples on the Text of Athias, or comparing it with the various readings: which are no doubt to be found in almoſt every inſtance.

with

with the idea of a Latin poet; *Primus in orbe deos fecit timor*—and if the Latin *Deus* be derived from the Greek Δεος, as ſome etymologiſts have imagined, and not from Θεος *; it would give probability to that idea. But ſince אלהים, as has been already ſaid, is evidently in a plural form, this derivation labours under the ſame difficulty as the former one.

Still more inadmiſſible are that of Rabbi Nahman (נחמן) who makes it a compound of אל and הם, *Their-God*; and that of ſome moderns, who would have it to be a compound of אל and הים, *The-god of the waters*.—So I now proceed to the ſecond mode of derivation; according to which אלוה is not a compound, but a pure derivative. And here, again, the learned are divided.

Hutchinſon, and the whole Hutchinſonian ſchool, derive it from אלה to *ſwear*, to *curſe*: and hence, according to them, אלוה, in the ſingular, means *The accurſed one*, i. e. JESUS the ſecond perſon of the Trinity, who was accurſed for the ſins of men: but the plural אלהים denotes "the *Denouncers of a conditional curſe*, (ſays Parkhurſt) uſually given in Hebrew Scrip-"tures to the ever bleſſed Trinity: by which they repreſent themſelves as under the obligation "of an *oath* to perform certain conditions; and as having denounced a *curſe* upon all men "and devils, who do not conform to them."—If any critic be contented with this etymon and this interpretation, he may adopt them: to me both appear fanciful and abſurd.

For, in the firſt place, it is taken for granted, that אלוה GOD, is derived from אלה to *ſwear*; whereas it is much more probable that אלה is itſelf a denominative verb from אל, ſignifying to *adjure by* GOD: as we might ſay of an habitual ſwearer, he *by-gods* it, at every other word.—This, I am fully convinced, is the true derivation of the verb אלה.

In the next place, the Hutchinſonians fondly ſuppoſe that the plurals אלהים and אלהי denote the three perſons of "the ever bleſſed Trinity:" as wild a ſuppoſition, in my conception, as ever was ſuppoſed. What! doth a term, which is equally applied to *Beel-zebub* the god of Ekron, to *Chamoſh* the god of Moab, to *Moloch* the god of the Ammonites; to the gods of Hamath, Arphad, Sepharvaim, Ena and Ava, denote the *ever bleſſed Trinity?* Yet to all theſe obſcene deities the word אלהים is applied by the Hebrew writers: a profanation hardly poſſible, if they believed that the term itſelf contained the moſt profound ſacred myſteries; or indeed any property or attribute peculiar to their own God JEHOVAH; which latter term they never apply to any other god.

Again, if אלהים ſignify the three perſons of the God-head, how are we to explain, in the Hutchinſonian ſyſtem, רוח אלהים the *Spirit of God?* Why truly we muſt ſay that he is the ſpirit of himſelf! in as much as he is ſuppoſed to be one of the perſons of that Trinity!—If the doctrine of a Trinity ſtand not on a firmer foundation than this, it will not certainly bear a rude ſhake.

Others, and, according to Michaelis, with a much greater degree of veriſimilitude, derive it from the Arabic אלה, or rather ולה, *attonitus fuit, obſtupuit*, &c. But this epithet is more ſuitable to the *worſhipper* than to the *worſhipped*. Even if the verb could bear an active ſignification, *ſtupefecit* inſtead of *obſtupuit*, the *vau*, I apprehend, in the word אלוה muſt change its place, in order to effect a regular derivation.

* That this however is the true derivation I have no doubt.

Were

Were I to derive אלוה from any ſingle root, it would be from the Arabic אלי, which denotes *beneficence*, *bounty*, &c. the moſt amiable attribute of the Deity; and from which we and all the Gothic tribes have denominated the ſupreme being, GOD.—In this ſuppoſition, I ſhould be inclined to think, that the *vau* is an interloper; and that the Samaritan reading, in the Pentateuch, is the true original reading. This is the more probable, as the Chaldee, Syriac and Arabic have all אלה; which, when pointed, takes a *kamets*, and not a *holem*, after *lamed*; and ſo, likewiſe, in their reſpective plurals אלהין and אלהא. In this caſe, I ſhould call אל not the *root*, but the abbreviation of אלה and אלהים, as יה is evidently the abbreviation of יהוה.—I balance, therefore, between this etymon and the firſt compound one, and am at a loſs which to prefer.

One query, partly grammatical, ſtill remains unanſwered. Do the plural forms אלהים and אלהי denote a plurality of perſons, when applied to the One true GOD?—No; not any more than אדונים and אדוני denote a plurality of *Lords*, בוראים and בוראי a plurality of *Creators*, פנים and פני a plurality of *faces*, or חיים a plurality of *lives*.—It is truly ſtrange that ſuch a notion ſhould ever have been entertained: and indeed it is only a modern notion, of the ſame age with ſcholaſtic theology. The Chriſtian Fathers of the Church, who were eager enough to diſcover in the Old Teſtament proofs of a Trinity, never dreamed of ſeeking one in אלהים *. Hear Jerom on the word: "Scire autem debemus, quod ELOIM communis numeri ſit; et "quod unus Deus ſic vocetur, et plures: ad quam ſimilitudinem *cœli* quoque appellantur et "*cœlum*; id eſt SAMAIM (unde et ſæpe interpretes variant)—Cujus rei exemplum nos in "lingua noſtra habere poſſumus: *Athenas*, *Thebas*, *Salonas*" Ep. ad Marcellam, vol. 2. p. 705. ed. Bened. It has been already remarked, that the term אלהים is applied not only to the true GOD, but to falſe gods; and even to a ſingle falſe god, whether male or female, ſuch as *Baal*, *Dagon*, *Aſhtharoth*, &c. It is applied to one angel in Jud. 13. 22. and to one man, Moſes, Exod. 4. 16. and 7. 1. Nay, the golden calf is called, by Aaron himſelf, אלהי זהב gods of gold The plural number then is no proof of a Trinity of Gods, or Perſons: and this is, indeed, allowed by the beſt commentators, whether Catholic or Proteſtant. See Druſius's Diſſertation on the word אלהים in the ſecond volume of the Sacred Critics, part 2. p. 298.

For the reſt, the application of the term to great men, as well as to GOD, was not peculiar to the Hebrews: the Greek ΘΕΟΣ, and the Latin DEUS and DIVUS, had often the like appropriations: particularly among the poets.—So natural is it for men in high ſtations to *receive*, and men in low ſtations to *give*, epithets and appellations that belong only to the great Supreme Being.

How the plural number אלהים came to be in ſuch general uſe among the Hebrews, even when it denotes the one true GOD, may perhaps be thus rationally accounted for: Before the vocation of Abraham, polytheiſm ſeems generally to have prevailed: the gods, therefore, would be a general term. The error, in worſhip, was rectified by the Hebrew legiſlator: but ſtubborn language has ſeldom been known to bend even to legiſlative power; and a term, once

* Calmet, indeed, quotes Origen, Jerom and Epiphanius; but theſe good fathers draw their proofs of a Trinity, not from אלהים, but from the word נעשה *let* us *make*. Gen. 1. 26.

become

become idiomatical, is not eaſily diſlodged. Thus אלהים, we may ſuppoſe, obſtinately kept its place in the Hebrew or rather Phenician dialect: although its meaning was generally reſtricted to one God, by putting the concording verb or adjective in the ſingular number. Every language hath ſome ſuch peculiarities. The Greeks, even the polite Athenians, could ſay and write Ζωα τρεχει The animals *runs*. Δι' ὁμιχλης τα σωματα μειζονα φαινεται, Bodies *appears* greater through a cloud. The correct and elegant Plato could ſay Εστιν οἱτινες There *is* ſome; juſt as the French ſcruple not to ſay, *Il eſt des hommes—Il eſt des cas*—and *C'eſt vous, qui* &c.; nor we, "It *was* the French who *were* the aggreſſors:" although, ſtrictly ſpeaking, all theſe phraſes are real ſoleciſms. And ſo is the word *means* with a ſingular verb or adjective: which however is ſtill, in ſpite of Lowth's remonſtrance, uſed even by polite ſpeakers; who never think of the impropriety.

Ib. *Created.* ברא. This word has, chiefly on the authority of Maimonides, been conſidered as implying what Theologians call *an abſolute creation out of nothing*. I am firmly perſuaded that it never has that meaning. It rather means to *faſhion*, *form*, and *decorate* a matter already exiſting: and here, in particular, it means to retrieve from a ſtate of deſolation, and embelliſh this little ſpot of earth, to render it fit for its inhabitants.

In the ſame limited ſenſe God is afterwards ch. 2. 7. ſaid to have *created* man, not out of *nothing*, but out of the *duſt* of the ground. Joſhuah 17. 15, 18, bids the children of Joſeph *create* to themſelves a more ample poſſeſſion, by cutting down the woods. Goliath 1 Sam. 18. 8, deſires the Iſraelites to *create*, that is, *chooſe* or *prepare*, a proper champion to fight with him. In Numb. 16. 30, 1 Kings 12. 33, and Nehem. 6. 8, it ſignifies to *deviſe*; and ſo, in Kings, our tranſlators render it: but in Numbers they render it *make*, and in Nehemiah *feign*: whereas *deviſe* would have been equally proper in all the three places *.—In ſhort, the word ברא to me appeareth to have the ſame meaning, or rather to be the ſelf-ſame word, with the Latin PARO †; not, as Michaelis thought, with *pario*; which is, I think, evidently derived from פרה *to be fruitful*.—It is, perhaps, worth remarking that, in the Scoto-Saxon dialect, the word ברא is ſtill uſed in its original meaning, and is compoſed of the ſame letters BRA; which ſignifies *adorned*, *decorated*, *newly-clad*, &c. ‡ The French *parer* is doubtleſs of the ſame family.

But is it hereby meant to be inſinuated, that this unfaſhioned matter itſelf was not originally created out of nothing? By no means: all that, as a philologiſt, I inſiſt on, is, that the word ברא implies no ſuch meaning: and, to ſpeak my mind freely, it is my belief that the Hebrew coſmologiſt had no ſuch idea. It is my belief that the more antient Jews held nearly the ſame opinion on this point, as the Pythagoricians and elder Platoniſts; namely, that matter was co-eternal with God; as the ſun's rays are co-eval with the ſun ‖.—Philo clearly expreſſes

* See the remark on ch. 2. ver. 3.

† Nay, the word is ſo rendered by Theodotion, ετοιμασαι. Ezech. 21. 19. and by the Chaldee Paraphraſt תתקן. Joſh. 17. 15.

‡ Be not ſurpriſed, good reader, at my finding Hebrew in the Scoto-Saxon dialect. I truſt I ſhall, one day, be able to prove that almoſt all our genuine Saxon words are either Hebrew, Chaldee, Arabic or Perſic.

‖ Thoſe who admit the eternal generation of the Logos (which they ſometimes endeavour to elucidate by the ſame Platonic ſimile) cannot reaſonably object to the Platonic doctrine of the eternal generation of matter.

himſelf after the Platonic manner: "Moſes, ſays he, knew that there muſt be, in the nature "of things, one ACTIVE being, and another PASSIVE being: and that the ACTIVE is the moſt "ſimple pure MIND of the univerſe, ὁ των ολων ΝΟΥΣ ειλικρινεςαΤος και ακραιφνεςαΤος; more "excellent than virtue, more excellent than knowledge; the ſupremely GOOD, the ſupremely "BEAUTIFUL: whereas the PASSIVE is inanimate, and, of its own nature, motionleſs: but, "endowed, by MIND, with *motion, form* and *animation*, it becomes a perfect work; that is, "*this very world*, τον δε τον κοσμον." Coſmop. vol. i. p. 5. nov. ed.

I have obſerved, in my Preface to the Pentateuch, that the author of the Book of Wiſdom believed, that the almighty hand of God created the world out of unfaſhioned matter, εξ αμορφου ὑλης: and Juſtin Martyr, having in view this paſſage, ſays it was the Chriſtian doctrine of his time, Παντα, την αρχην, αγαθον οντα δημιουργησαι αυτον [Θεον] εξ αμορφου ὑλης διδαγμεθα. Apol. I. No. 10. ed. Ben. And in another place of the ſame Apology, No. 59, he affirms that the doctrine of Plato, with reſpect to the creation of the world, is the very doctrine of Moſes, and from Moſes borrowed. "Ινα δε και παρα των ἡμετερων διδασκαλων λαβοντα τον Πλατωνα "μαθητε το ειπειν, ὑλην αμορφον χρεψαντα, κοσμον ποιησαι, ακουσατε των αυτολεξει ειρημενων δια "Μωσεως. κ. τ. λ."—Again, No. 67, he ſays: "We aſſemble on Sunday; both becauſe it is "the firſt day, in which God, changing *darkneſs and matter*, το σκοτος και την ὑλην, made the "world."

The paſſage of Wiſdom is alſo quoted by Origen; but with this remark, that the Book is not *by all* received as canonical ſcripture. He adds however, that it was the more general opinion, that original matter is deſignated in the beginning of Geneſis. "Quamplurimi ſane "putant, rerum ipſam materiam ſignificari in eo quod, in principio Geneſis ſcriptum eſt a "Moyſe: *In principio creavit Deus cœlum et terram: terra autem erat inviſibilis et incompoſita.* "Inviſibilem namque et incompoſitam non aliud eis [al. eſſe] Moyſes quam *informem mate-* "*riam* viſus eſt indicare." Peri Arch. l. iv. No. 33. Ex Verſione Ruffini.

A paſſage in the ſecond Book of Machabees has been oppoſed to that of the Book of Wiſdom, and given, by thoſe who believe the former to be canonical ſcripture, as a poſitive ſcriptural proof of a *creation out of nothing*. It is in ch. 7. 28, which, according to the Latin Vulgate, runs thus: "Peto, nate, ut aſpicias ad cœlum et terram, et ad omnia quæ in eis "ſunt; et intelligas, quia ex NIHILO fecit illa Deus." Here, ſay they, it is plainly aſſerted that God made all things out of nothing! It is ſo; but this only ſhews, with what circumſpection the Latin Vulgate, and indeed all tranſlations, ought to be uſed in confirmation of any particular dogmatico-ſcholaſtic opinion: for, on the ſole inſpection of the Greek Text, the fallacy is diſcovered; and the very language of the Platoniſts preſents itſelf. The words are εξ ουκ οντων [not μηδενος] which our Engliſh tranſlators inaccurately, not to ſay abſurdly, render "of things that were not." For how can things *be* things and *not be* things?—But admitting the Platonic explanation, εκ ον or μη ον is nothing elſe than unfaſhioned matter; and γενεσθαι τι εκ μη οντος is merely to become what it was not before; that is, to be clothed in ſome *new, ſpecific, ſtable* form *.

There is in Paul's firſt Epiſtle to the Corinthians, chap. 1. 28, a paſſage ſtrongly illuſtrative

* See Moſheim's excellent Diſſertation *De creatione mundi ex nihilo.*

of

of the true meaning of το μη ον. "Τα αγενη του κοσμου και τα εξουθενημενα εξελεξατο ὁ Θεος, και "τα MH ONTA, ἱνα τα ONTA καταργηση:" the laſt comma of which our tranſlators render: "and things which *are not*, to bring to nought things that *are*:" a verſion, which, if literally underſtood, is abſurd: but in the language of the Platoniſts perfectly intelligible, and conſonant with the preceding member. Τα μη οντα could not, in the meaning of the Apoſtle, ſignify *nothing* in oppoſition to *ſomething*; but merely *things* and *perſons* comparatively of *no account*, in the eyes of the world: as we often ſay, catachreſtically, "Such a one is *nothing* at all."

On the whole, two things, I preſume, have been clearly ſhewn; 1ſt, That it was a current opinion among the antient Jews, and earlieſt Chriſtians, that the world was created, by God, of pre-exiſting unfaſhioned matter. How long that matter had exiſted before the ſix days creation, is a queſtion in which I am not, at preſent, concerned; nor will I ever wrangle with any one about matters of mere opinion.—2dly, That the word ברא nowhere ſignifies to *create out of nothing*: nay, nor any other word by which it has been rendered; ſuch as חלק in Arabic, טלמס in Samaritan, אפריד in Perſic *, ποιειν in Greek, *creare* in Latin: nor can I find, that any ſingle word in any language, with which I am acquainted, ever meant a *creation out of nothing*. Indeed, if it did, what need were there of adding *out of nothing* to complete its ſignification?

From all that has been here ſaid, it is then highly probable at leaſt, that the firſt verſe of Geneſis is to be referred, not to a prior epoch, but to the operations that follow; and that the words of Geneſis are equivalent to "When God, in the beginning, created thoſe heavens and "this earth"—or perhaps better ſtill; "Before God created," &c.—This being pre-ſuppoſed to be the real meaning, we have in the ſix days creation a conſiſtent, harmonious plan, well imagined, and beautifully pourtrayed; as will more evidently appear, in our progreſs through the narrative.

1b. *The Heavens.* השמים—Here is another plural, which might be, and is often, rendered in the ſingular: but, as our language admits both forms, I have throughout preferred the plural. Indeed, our vernacular *heaven* and *heavens* are the natural progeny of the Chaldee form; שמין *ſhamin* or *ſhemin*; changed firſt, by a very common aphæreſis, into *hemin*; next into *hevin*; and laſtly into *heaven*. Our ſiſter dialects retain the *m*; but change the final *n* into *l*: and write *himmel*, *hemmel*, or *hemel*. In Gothic it is *himmins*.—In like manner, our word *earth* is the identical Hebrew word ארץ, which is derived from an Arabic root, that ſignifies *low*, as שמים is from another Arabic root, that denoteth *high*: and thus they are characteriſed in the Decalogue: "The heavens *above*, and the earth *below*."

Verſe 2. *The earth was yet a deſolate waſte.* Dathe and ſome others, who refer the firſt verſe to a prior creation, render the ſecond verſe thus: "The earth had *afterwards* become a "deſolate waſte," &c. I have preferred a term, which, although it readily accords with this hypotheſis, excludes not deciſively any other. The words תהו and בהו, which I render *a deſolate waſte*, preſent, in all the few paſſages where they occur †, the idea of *dreary and diſmal deſolation*. *Inanity* and *vacuity* ſeem to be but acceſſory and ſecondary acceptations. Yet

* Syr. and Chald. retain the Hebrew word. † See Deut. 32. 10. Job 12. 24. Pſ. 108. 40. Jerem. 4. 23.

Aquila and Theodotion render them by the Greek words κενωμα και αθεν—κενον και αδεν: whence Jerom ſeems to have partly borrowed his *inanis et vacua*. What the more antient Greek tranſlators ſaw in them, when they rendered them by αορατος και ακατασκευαστος, *inviſible and unfurniſhed*; or Saadias, when he rendered נאמרת מסתבחרת *immerſed in deep ſea*; it is hard to ſay. They both ſeem to have gueſſed at ſome indiſtinct general meaning, that ſhould not be unſuitable to the context *. For ſuch, in fact, was the then actual ſituation of the earth; as is moſt beautifully expreſſed in the 104th Pſalm, ver. 6.: "With the ſea thou "hadſt covered it, as with a mantle: the waters were raiſed above the mountains:" which paſſage, as Dathe well obſerves, greatly favours the hypotheſis of a pre-exiſting earth in a ſtate of deſolation.

Ib. *With darkneſs upon the face of the deep.* This greatly heightens the gloomineſs of the ſcene. The word חשך which we render darkneſs does not neceſſarily imply an abſolute excluſion of all light; but that ſort of caliginous darkneſs which the abſence of the ſun and a very denſe cloudy atmoſphere produce.—The earth was covered with deep water, and that water was covered with a thick darkneſs.

Ib. *And a mighty wind overſweeping*, &c. That the words רוח אלהים can have no other meaning, to me ſeems clear from the following circumſtances: Firſt, they cannot, without violence to grammar, be disjoined from ver. 2; and conſequently appertain to the deſcription of the ſtate of the earth before the ſix days creation. Secondly, it is hard to ſay how the ſpirit of God, as a creating ſpirit, ſhould here be introduced: which evidently diminiſheth the force and beauty of ver. 3, ſo juſtly admired by Longinus as an example of the ſublime; and ſo ably defended by Boileau againſt the cavils of Huet and Le Clerc. Thirdly, not only Onkelos and Jonathan, but both the Arabs and the Perſic agree in underſtanding רוח of a wind: nay, all the other antient tranſlators ought, I conceive, to be ſo underſtood; as the terms which they employ in rendering it רוחה Syriac, πνευμα Greek, *ſpiritus* Latin, more properly denote *air*, *breath*, *wind*, than what we commonly call *ſpirit*; this latter being only a ſecondary and metaphorical acceptation. The Greek word is derived from πνειω *to breathe* or *blow*: hence Ariſtotle ſays, "the wind is nothing elſe than a quantity of thickened fluctuating air; which "is alſo called *ſpirit*, πνευμα: although in another ſenſe *ſpirit*, πνευμα, is uſed to denominate that "animated and generative ſubſtance that exiſts in plants and animals," Ανεμος ουδεν εστιν πλην ΑΗΡ πολυς ῥεων και αθροος, ὃσις αἱμα και ΠΝΕΥΜΑ λεγεται. Λεγεται δε και ἑτερως πνευμα ἡ εν φυτοις και ζωοις εμψυχος τε και γονιμος ουσια.—So the Latin *ſpiritus* from *ſpiro*, in its original and literal ſignification, denotes *breath*, *air*. Cicero, "AER, ſpiritu ductus, alit animantes." All its other ſignifications are tralatitious.

Nothing was more natural than for the Hebrews, whoſe language was ſo poor in abſtract definite terms, to call a great wind the *breath of God*, as they called *thunder* his *voice*, the clouds his *habitation*, *his chariot*; the *lightnings* and *winds* his *miniſters* and *meſſengers*, &c. Thus Moſes in the beautiful ſong after the paſſage of the Red Sea נשמת ברוחך "With thy breath

* With regard to the other verſions, the Syr. and both Thargums retain the Hebrew words: Onkelos, the Erpenian Arab and the Perſic correſpond with my tranſlation.

"thou

" thou blowedſt: the ſea overwhelmed them." Exod. 15. 10.* And the Pſalmiſt, deſcribing a ſudden thaw, ſays, " ישב רוחו יזלו מים He changeth his ſpirit: [wind] the waters flow." Pſ. 147. 18. So Iſaiah 40. 7. " The graſs withereth! the flower fadeth! becauſe the *ſpirit* " of the Lord bloweth upon them."—The literal ſignification then of רוח is *air, wind, breath:* and רוח אלהים is literally *the breath of God*, that is, a great wind. In a metaphorical ſenſe, the ſame words mean any divine *influence, impulſe, inſpiration:* and theſe are the only two meanings they have in the Hebrew ſcriptures.—Thoſe who have found in the רוח אלהים of Geneſis the *perſon* of the HOLY GHOST, have been very little verſed in the language of the Eaſt; and paid very little attention to the conſtruction of the Text. Every thing in that conſtruction determines the words to belong to what goes before. Had the writer meant to couple it with a new period, he would have written רחפה, not מרחפת; and, indeed, the antient Syriac, Chaldaic, Greek, and Latin tranſlators ſeem to have been aware of this; as they render, either participially with the original מרחפא, מנשבא, or in the imperfect tenſe επεφερετο †, *ferebatur:* which are equivalent to the participle מרחפת.—With reſpect to the word itſelf, it is hard to determine its proper and preciſe meaning. It occurs but thrice, in any form, in the Hebrew ſcriptures; namely here, Deut. 32. 11, and Jeremiah 23. 9, nor is much light to be obtained from the ſiſter dialects. In Deut. the meaning is in ſome meaſure determined by the context; and I have, with little heſitation, rendered it *hovereth* ‡. In Jeremiah, likewiſe, we are helped to the proper ſignification, by the ſimile that accompanies it: " My bones *ſhake:* I am " like a drunken man," &c. Combining both theſe ſignifications, we may form ſome idea of the word here connected with wind: yet it is not eaſy to find an Engliſh word to expreſs that meaning. Onkelos, both Arabs, and the Samaritan verſion have words correſponding to our *blowing* or *bluſtering*; and I had once rendered by this laſt term. I have now changed it into *overſweeping*; but, perhaps, *agitating* would be better.—At any rate, the earth, at this period, was, according to the Hebrew coſmologiſt, entirely covered with ſea, a ſea without ſhore; and this ſea was covered with a denſe, dark, tempeſtuous atmoſphere which made the whole terraqueous globe inviſible; when the Almighty Creator, reſolving to retrieve it from that diſmal ſtate, ſaid,

Ver. 3. *Let there be light: and there was light.* The original יהי אור ויהי־אור is more conciſe and emphatical. " Be light; and light was." And this is the rendering of our firſt tranſlator Wicliffe; who uniformly in all ſimilar phraſes uſes the ſimple imperative: *Be light* ‖—*be a firmament—produce earth—make we man.* And, here, I cannot help wondering that our language has not yet got rid of that vile expletive *there*, than which I know none more uſeleſs or inſignificant. For example, in the following: " *There* was a man in the land of Uz:" the

* So our Aelfric: " Thu ſendeſt gaeſt thine." *Thou ſendeſt thy ghoſt.* And ſtill we ſay to give *up the ghoſt*, as the Latins ſaid *emittere ſpiritum.* The word *aand*, or *aande*, or *ande*, which in Iſlandic ſignifies *breath*, in Swediſh ſignifies *ſpirit* in its moſt exalted meaning; as " Gud aer an ande:" *God is a ſpirit.* And in Daniſh the ſame word has all the three meanings, *wind, breath, ſpirit.*

† Aquila, Theodotion and Symmachus have more properly επιφερομενον.

‡ Our common verſion hath *fluttereth*; and, at this moment, I doubt whether it be not a more proper term than the one I have ſubſtituted.

‖ So alſo the older Saxon *Geveorthe lecht.*

phraſe

phraſe is juſt as bad, or rather more improper than the vulgariſm *That there man.* It ſeems to have crept into our dialect from the Dutch: *Daer was een man,* &c. How much more ſimple and elegant our Wicliffe: "A man, Joob by name, was in the land of Hus." So the Italian of Malermi: "Nella terra de Hus era un' huomo"—and Bruccioli: "Nel paeſe de Us fu un "huomo."—So alſo the Spaniſh of Ferrara: "Varon fue in tierra de Hus."—The French phraſe indeed "Il y avoit un homme" is more ridiculous than ours: yet ſtill it equally keeps its hold: ſo difficult is it to purify a language from inveterate and authoriſed errors!

There, as an expletive, is bad enough alone; but when the word *let* precedes it, a double pleonaſm ariſes; and the phraſe is not only more clumſy and improper; but, when put in the mouth of God, impertinent and degrading. *Let* is the ſame as *permit* *: and when God is made to ſay "Let there be light;" or even "Let light be;" he is made to ſay: "Permit light "to be." So, "Let there be an expanſe," &c. is equivalent to "Permit an expanſe to be"—and "Let us make man," to "Permit us to make man!"—Will no writer of eſtabliſhed credit be bold enough to deviate from the beaten track? or ſhall the panic dread of *innovation* prevent us from any attempt at meliorating either our *language* or our *government?*

God ſaid, LET THERE BE LIGHT—and there was light. See how the proſpect begins to brighten, if proſpect it might be called, what was hardly viſible. This was the firſt ſtep to recover the earth from its deſolate condition, and the commencement of the ſix days creation. It has been obſerved, in the explanatory note, that the light here mentioned, may readily be conceived to have been a partial, incipient light, which progreſſively † penetrating the denſe atmoſphere that enveloped the ſea-covered earth, ſo rarefied and expanded it in the courſe of three days, as to admit the clear and uninterrupted viſion of the celeſtial luminaries.

It is diverting to read the various opinions of commentators with regard to this incipient primeval light.—It was, ſays one, *an infant ſun,* not yet grown to maturity—It was not an *infant ſun,* ſays another, but the *elemental fire*—It was not the elemental fire, ſays a third, but *light in the abſtract*—It was a *lucid cloud,* ſays a fourth, like that which led the Iſraelites through the wilderneſs—It could not be a lucid cloud, ſays a fifth; for that *pre-ſuppoſes* light. Well, what was it then? In my humble opinion, it was nothing more, nor leſs, than an emanation from the ſame SUN that ſtill enlightens us; and which, although it had not yet appeared in its full glory, yet ſhed ſufficient light through the denſe atmoſphere, to make the ſurface of the terraqueous globe viſible ‡: ſuch as we muſt often have obſerved in hazy weather; and of which we had a ſingular inſtance in laſt November §, in the neighbourhood of London: although even then the diſtinction between day and night was perfectly diſcernible.

This was evidently the idea of Origen, and I apprehend of Baſil alſo. The former affirms that "no one of a ſane mind can imagine that there was an evening and a morning, during

* The word *let* is one of the moſt ſingular in our language: It has two meanings diametrically oppoſite: to *permit* and to *hinder*. But this double ſignification ariſes from two different roots; the French *laiſſer*, and the Saxon *lettan*. In this laſt ſenſe it would be better to write *lett*.

† This natural gradation is obſervable in every part of the *Hexaëmeron*; and the author muſt have had it in view, when he ſat down to write his coſmogony. See the remark at the cloſe of the chapter.

‡ Bene hic Hezel. *Gott removirte nemlich dar Hinderniſs, welches er biſher der ſonne geſetſt hatte.*

§ 1797.

"the

"the three firſt days, without a ſun." Peri Archon. l. 4. ch. 14.—The latter aſcribes the darkneſs that covered the earth before the appearance of light to the interpoſition of a denſe body. So Hexaem. homil. 2.

Ver. 4. *And God ſaw, that the light was good:* that is, fit for its intended purpoſes. Syr. *beautiful.*—The author, throughout, makes the Creator ſpeak after the manner of man; like a wiſe architect, who contrives, examines, and approves his plans and their execution.

Ib. *And God diſtinguiſhed the light from the darkneſs.* I uſe the word *diſtinguiſh* in its proper and primitive ſignification. The meaning is, he aſſigned to each its proper boundary. Whether the author was acquainted with the rotatory motion of the earth round its axis, which effects the diſtinction between light and darkneſs, is a queſtion of little moment. He ſpoke the language of oſtenſible nature, not that of philoſophy or aſtronomy; of the laws of which he was, probably, ignorant.

Ver. 5. *And God called the light day,* &c. Dathe and Roſenmüller think that יקרא ſhould, on account of the prefix ל, be here rendered *deſtinavit, deſignavit: he aſſigned, the light to day; and the darkneſs, to night.* I think the *lamed* before יום and לילה warrants no ſuch rendering.

Ib. *The evening came, and the morning came, one day;* ויהי ערב ויהי בקרי יום אחד. Theſe words are commonly rendered, "The evening and the morning were the firſt (or *one*) day." A tranſlation, which has always appeared to me contrary to the meaning of the original, and contrary to nature. An entire day, or ἡμερονυκτιον, conſiſts not of evening and morning, but of day and night: and nothing, I think, is clearer, than that the Hebrew writer meant to expreſs the *lapſe,* not the *continuity* of time. To draw from the Hebrew words the meaning commonly given to them, they ſhould be thus conſtructed: ויהיו ערב ובקר ליום אחד, and even then they would ſeem awkward and inconſiſtent. For how can the evening and the morning be ſaid to conſtitute a day? If taken in order as two terms of the ſame period of time, they embrace only the duration of night; and if they be conſidered ſeparately, as the terminations of light and of darkneſs, they embrace no duration at all. "But," ſay commentators, "the terms "ſtand here, each for the preceding period: evening here denotes that night of darkneſs which "covered the face of the deep, before the appearance of light; and morning denotes the "day that followed that darkneſs." Wonderful denotation this! *Evening,* which, according to the regular order of things, neceſſarily pre-ſuppoſes *day,* and is the concluſive term of day, is here converted into a night unpreceded by any day.—Thus are the cleareſt terms tortured to ſupport inſupportable, but inveterate, ſyſtems, ſanctioned by the authority of great names. For why have the Hebrew Text, and all the antient verſions, been made, contrary to the known rules of grammar, to ſay what they ſay not, what they cannot ſay; but becauſe the Jews counted the hours of their artificial day from ſun-ſetting? Had they happened to begin it at mid-night, or ſun-riſing, or mid-day, the evening and morning of Geneſis might, with equal ingenioufneſs, have been adapted to any of theſe periods. But whatever ingenuity may be employed to pervert their meaning, ערב can here mean nothing elſe than the gradual diſappearance of *light;* בקר nothing elſe than its gradual re-appearance.

I have ſaid, that not only the original text has been miſinterpreted, but alſo the antient verſions. For all of them (except perhaps the Latin Vulgate), when properly pointed, expreſs the true

true meaning of the Hebrew. For example, the Greek Και εγενετο εσπερα, και εγενετο πρωι, μια ημερη· και ειπε Θεος, &c. So Syr. Chald. and both Arabs. Nay, the Vulgate itſelf admits the ſame meaning; only the repetition of *factum* is not made: for, if it were, and the comma thus diſtinguiſhed, Et factum eſt veſpere, et factum eſt mane, dies unus; et dixit Deus, &c. it would exactly correſpond with the Greek and Hebrew: for it is well known that *fieri* is in the Vulgate often equivalent to *eſſe*, as *Fiat lux*. Indeed, had the Latin tranſlator meant to ſay that the evening and morning conſtituted the firſt day, he would have uſed another mode of expreſſion, and ſaid, "Factum eſt veſpere et mane *in* diem unum," as he does afterwards chap. 2. 7. "Et factus eſt homo *in* animam viventem." But however this be, it is evident, I think, that the Hebrew writer meant to ſay, That when a whole ημερονυκτιον, or day and night, had paſſed; God, next morning, began to reſume his operations upon the earth.

In juſtice to two great luminaries of the Greek Church, Baſil and Chryſoſtom, I muſt remark, that they both reprobate in the ſtrongeſt terms the idle notion which I have been combating. See Baſil. Hexaem. hom. ii. and Chryſoſt. on Geneſis, homil. iv. and v. The Latin Father, Auſtin, too, treating expreſsly on the text in queſtion, has ſo well explained the matter, that I ſhall preſent the reader with his own words: "*Et factum eſt veſpere* *, *et factum eſt mane, dies unus*. Et hic calumniantur Manichæi, dum putant ita dictum eſſe, quaſi a veſpera dies cœperit. Non intelligunt operationem illam qua *lux facta eſt, et diviſum eſt inter lucem et tenebras; et vocata eſt lux* DIES, *et tenebræ* NOX. Hanc ergo totam operationem non intelligunt ad diem pertinere. Poſt hanc autem operationem, tanquam finito die, facta eſt veſpera. Sed, quia etiam nox ad *diem ſuum pertinet*; non dicitur *tranſiſſe dies unus*, niſi etiam *nocte tranſactâ*, cum factum eſt *mane*. Sic, deinceps, reliqui dies computantur, a *mane uſque ad mane*. Nunc enim, *cum factum eſt mane, et tranſactus eſt unus dies*, incipit operatio quæ ſequitur ab ipſo mane, quod jam factum eſt: et poſt ipſam operationem fit veſpera, deinde mane; et tranſit altera dies: atque ita, deinceps, cæteri dies tranſeunt." De Geneſi contra Manich. lib. 1.—No commentator has better entered into the meaning of the text, or more clearly expreſſed that meaning, than this good African Biſhop.—May we not hope never more to ſee the words rendered *The evening and the morning were the firſt day*: or, as the Doway tranſlators miſ-tranſlate the Vulgate: "And there was evening and morning, that *made* one day."

It is here but fair to acknowledge that, of modern tranſlations, thoſe of Pagninus, Munſter, Leo Judah, Junius, Oleaſter, the laſt reviſion of the French verſion of Geneva, the Italian of Diodati †, and ſome others; although in ſome degree ambiguous, are all ſuſceptible of the true meaning; and ſo are the verſions of our Bate and Purver. How ſuch men as Caſtalio, Houbigant and Dathe ſhould tranſlate as they have done, is rather a matter of aſtoniſhment; but they were all probably miſled by the Latin Vulgate; and the Jewiſh mode of reckoning their days.

One complete day and night have now paſſed; and the dawn of a new day hath ariſen;

* Some copies have *facta eſt veſpera*. Auſtin quotes from the old Italic, which was a literal verſion of the Greek.

† For Bruccioli makes clear work of it, "E fu *fatto de la ſera e della mattina* il primo giorno." Nor leſs explicit is the French of Saci and even of Le Gros: "Du ſoir et du matin *ſe fit* le premier jour."

when

when our cosmologist makes God resume his operations, and begin the work of a SECOND DAY.—Light, a partial light, had dispelled a part of the thick darkness that *covered the face of the deep*; but the waters of the deep still overspread the face of the earth. These waters were to be disposed of, and the ambient air to be further attenuated: for which purpose God said:

Ver. 6. *Let there be an expanse* רקיע from רקע; the primary meaning of which is *expansion, out-stretching, attenuation, elasticity*; the very properties of our atmosphere. The word στερεωμα used by the Greek translators, and the long prevailing idea that the heavens were a solid body, led posterior interpreters to render it by the word *firmament:* and this as well as στερεωμα is admissible, if by solidity be meant no more, than that the fluid atmosphere has density or consistence sufficient to sustain the waters above it. This is indeed the sense in which St. Basil understood the Greek term; although he had not the Hebrew to direct him to it. See his third homily on the six days creation; where he calls it a childish idea to suppose any other solidity in the firmament, than that of a dense fluid; and very justly observes that, as such the scripture every where represents the lower region of the heavens. See Job 37. 18, and Jerem. 10. 12.

Ib. *And so it was.* I have transposed this from the end of the next verse, partly on the authority of the Septuagint *, and partly from the conviction that a uniform symmetrical mode of expression was used by the writer throughout the whole narrative. According to that symmetry, this is the proper place of the comma in question; and it is my firm belief that here it originally stood. Those who think otherwise may transpose it back.

The effect of this *expansion* was the separation of a part of the waters from the great mass. The lighter particles were exhaled, rarefied, and carried up into clouds, and formed the element of air, which is only attenuated water. The water contained in those clouds is called the waters above the *expanse*, in contradistinction to those which still remained upon the earth. See the explanatory note, vol. i. p. 2. The historian adds, that God called this expanse *the heavens*; which to me appears a strong corroboration of what I have already endeavoured to shew, that the first verse is to be referred to the following operations, and not to a prior epoch.

Ver. 8. *This, also, God saw to be good.* Here again, I think, the Greek version has alone preserved the integrity of the original text; for after no other operation is this formula wanting; and the want of it here destroys that harmony of composition so evidently intended by the author.

We have now a purer atmosphere and a clearer sky, but still our earth is drenched in water, and inept for production. That water must be partly removed, and confined within proper boundaries; and the THIRD DAY is assigned to that operation. "Let the waters, said God, "be collected into one place, that the dry land may appear. And so it was; for the waters "below the expanse were collected into their place; and the dry land appeared." Still the Septuagint supplies the deficiency of the present Hebrew text: for who can believe that the author would in this single instance deviate from his uniform plan, and neglect to tell us the consequence of God's command? There is a variety of reading in the Greek copies, but hardly

* I mean the Vatican, Aldine and Alexandrian copies: for the Complutensian edition, and two or three MSS. have it after ver. 7. But these copies, I presume, have been reformed according to the Hebrew.

worth remarking. The Roman, Aldine, and Oxford editions have εις τους συναγωγους υδατων: but the Complutenſian has, more properly, υδατου: υδωρ being the antecedent.

The waters have now ſuddenly retired into their deſtined receptacles, and left a portion of the chaotic maſs ſo dry as to be fit for vegetation. This, ſays our coſmologiſt, God called *earth*, as he called the collection of water *ſeas*. And, now, behold this earth veſted in verdure, and repleniſhed with all ſorts of herbs and trees; with inherent powers to reproduce themſelves, and continue their propagation to the end of time! How ſimply, but how beautifully, is all this expreſſed!

Ver. 11. *Graſs*. דשא. It has been ſuppoſed by ſome interpreters, that this is not a diſtinct ſpecies of vegetable; but means the bud or firſt ſhoot of both herb and tree, afterwards more particularly ſpecified. But this is not at all probable. The diſtinction between *graſs* and the larger *herbs* is natural, and common to all languages. Hence, דשא and עשב in Deut. 32. 2. are mentioned as diſtinct things; and in 2 Kings 19. 26. דשא is diſtinguiſhed from both עשב and עיר. So the Greeks had χορτος, χλωρεα, χλοη, and the Latins *gramen*, *herba*, *olus*.

What now is wanting to make the ſcene complete? A greater diſplay of light; by the full appearance of thoſe glorious luminaries, which, optically ſpeaking, had hitherto been veiled in miſt; which their rays had not yet been able to diſſipate and rarefy into a pure azure ſky. Three days had now elapſed, and a FOURTH began to dawn, when God ſaid—

Ver. 14. *Let there be luminaries in the expanſe of the heavens to illuminate the earth, and to diſtinguiſh the day from the night.*—The words *Let there be* are, in my conception, here equivalent to *Let there appear* *: and if I had allowed myſelf the freedom which ſome modern tranſlators have taken, I ſhould have thus rendered the verſe; "Let the luminaries, which are in the "expanſe of the heavens, be for the purpoſe of illuminating the earth," &c. The obſervation of Roſenmüller is ſo juſt, that I cannot withhold it from my readers: "Verba יהי מאורות non "ſunt a reliquis ſeparanda, nec vertenda *Fiant luminaria*, quod plerique faciunt interpretes. "Notandum eſt enim, verbum היה, ſi cum ל conſtruitur, plerumque *deſtinationem rei alicujus* "ad *aliquid* deſignare; non ejus productionem; ut Num. 10. 31. Zach. 8. 19."—I write מאורות with the Sam. copy and many MSS; not מארת from which, ſince the introduction of points, two *vaus* have been ſhamefully ejected. Many thouſands of words have been thus defalcated, which have their full complement of letters in the Sam. exemplar; and almoſt all of them in a leſs or greater number of MSS. This is one of the *bleſſings* we owe to that *wonderful work* the *Maſora*.—Were I to give a new edition of the Hebrew Bible, thoſe vacancies ſhould be all filled up, even without the aid of manuſcript authority.

To the addition which I have admitted into the text, on the authority of the Samaritan copy, the Greek verſion and one MS.; ſome Greek copies, ſuch as Alex. and Cott. add και αρχειν της ημερας και της νυκτος. The Glaſgow Octateuch has, likewiſe, this addition; but wants και διαχωριζειν ανα μεσον, &c. On the whole, there is a manifeſt redundancy in theſe two verſes; and I have ſome ſuſpicion that ver. 15. is an interpolation. I have accordingly included it in brackets; for my general rule is, not to reject altogether any thing that has the ſmalleſt probability of being authentic.

* So Cyril of Alexandria, ηλιου δε και σεληνης εφαινοντο κυκλοι. Tom. i. p. 4.

Ver. 16.

Ver. 16. *Two great luminaries.* Heb. גדלים *defective:* but Sam. with ſeven MSS. have גדולים *full;* and again גדול inſtead of גדל. I ſhall not henceforth mark this ſort of varieties, which are very numerous indeed.—The ſun and moon are equally called *great* luminaries from their equally apparent ſize, not from the degree of light which they give. Every thing is *optical* in this narrative, and adapted to the ſenſes of the ſuppoſed ſpectator.—I am not ſure but this verſe might be more properly rendered: "God appointed the two great luminaries, the one "greater luminary to regulate (or rule) the day; and the other leſs luminary, with the ſtars, "to regulate the night." So Dathe: "Deus igitur conſtituit duo magna luminaria; præfecit "autem, ex duobus illis luminaribus magnis, alterum majus regimini diei, alterum minus, "ſimul cum ſtellis, regimini noctis."

Ver. 17. *He diſplayed them,* literally *he gave them,* יתן אתם. The Latin Vulgate has a very ſingular reading, namely, "dedit *eas*," as if it referred only to the *ſtars* which immediately precede. It is hardly credible that Jerom ſo wrote; and yet I find no variety in any copy that I have ſeen, whether edited or MS. The old Italic verſion ſeems to have had *illa,* although Auſtin ſometimes quotes *illas,* if it be not a blunder of his tranſcribers. See Sabatier on the place.

Our earth is now become a delightful abode, but it is ſtill without inhabitants. Two days more ſhall people it with animals; and the water itſelf, which had hitherto been an obſtacle to production, ſhall firſt of all be made productive. "Let the waters" (ſaid God, ver. 21.) "*ſwarm* with living reptiles." Well might he uſe the word *ſwarm* שרץ; for the fecundity of fiſhes is beyond conception. I have tranſlated *reptiles,* becauſe I could not find a better term. The Latins might ſay *natatilia* or *natantia*; but neither would expreſs the force of the original. And, in reality, fiſhes are not leſs reptiles than ſerpents; and Jerom made no ſcruple of uſing *reptile* here *.—Even in modern language, when zoological preciſion is not ſought, *fiſhes* are called *reptiles.* Thus Volney, "Dieu, qui peuple l'air d'oiſeaux, la terre d'animaux, et les ondes "de *reptiles.*" See the explanatory note.

Ib. *Flying creatures.* עוף. It comprehends every winged creature, from the fowl to the inſect. It is well expreſſed by the Latin word *volatile;* and in Wicliffe's days the Engliſh word *volatile* ſeems to have been taken in that ſenſe; although it is now only metaphorically uſed. Our more antient Saxon verſion has *flying kind,* "fleogende cinn." Thoſe who have rendered "and flying creatures, that may fly," &c. making עוף the objective of ישרצו, have not ſufficiently attended to the idiom of the original. Hence however has been propagated the notion that the *flying creatures* were produced from the waters as well as the fiſhes.

Ver. 21. *Sea-monſters.* I have uſed a general term, as it is not clear what particular fiſh is meant, or whether the original word תנינים be not itſelf a generical term. I have ſaid in my explanatory note, that perhaps the *crocodile* may be here deſignated: and Mr. Hurdis, in a ſpecial Diſſertation on the word, has made that highly probable. Yet ſtill I think the *term* had a more extenſive meaning, and included other animals beſide the crocodile.

* And again, Pſ. 104. al. 103. "Illic *reptilia,* quorum non eſt numerus."—Diodati has *reptili*; and the Spaniſh of Ferrara *ſerpiente.* And what are *creeping things* in our common verſion, but *reptiles?*—Παν το νηκτικον, (ſays Baſil,) καὶν τῃ επιφανειᾳ επινηχῆται, καὶν δια βαθους τεμνῃ το ὑδωρ, της των ἑρπηστικων εστι φυσεως, επισυρομενον τῳ του ὑδατος σωματι. Hom. vii. in Hexaem.

The waters are peopled—the air is peopled—and terreſtrial animals are now only wanting. So, ſoon as the SIXTH day dawneth, God reſumes his work, and ſays,

Ver. 24. *Let the earth bring forth animals, according to their kinds: cattle, wild beaſts and reptiles.* The word rendered *cattle* has a more extenſive ſignification, and in general denotes any ſort of larger beaſts; but, when claſſed as here, it ſeems to be limited to domeſtic quadrupeds, diſtinguiſhed from wild-beaſts; literally *animals of the field* חית הארץ: for ſo rightly reads the Samaritan copy. The preſent Heb. has חיתו ארץ, a vile barbariſm, or, if its defenders chooſe, an Arabiſm; for certainly it is not an Hebraiſm. The blunder ſeems to have been committed before the change of letters; for in the Sam. alphabet the *he* and *vau* are often hardly diſtinguiſhable. I ſhall have more than one occaſion to take notice of ſuch changes.

Under the word *reptile* רמש is comprehended not only all the ſerpentine claſs, but alſo the ſmaller ſort of quadrupeds that ſeem to *creep* rather than to *walk*. In Arabic it is applied to long luxuriant graſs that ſeems to creep over the ground; and in this ſenſe it is ſtill uſed in ſome parts of Scotland in its original form, RAMSH.

We are now drawing near to the concluſion of the great work; but one animal is yet wanting.

Sanctus his animal mentiſque capacius altæ
Deerat adhuc; et quod dominari in cætera poſſet:
Natus homo eſt. OVID. Metam.

And now the narrative aſſumes a more ſolemn air, and a more dignified ſtyle:

Ver. 26. *Let us make man,* &c. What grand ideas are here preſented to view! Omnipotent power ſeeming to exert itſelf, by a laſt effort, in the formation of a Being, which ſhould in ſome degree bear its *own* reſemblance! and that Being conſtituted the ſovereign of the earth! —Coſmologiſts of Egypt, Chaldæa, Greece and Italy! hide your diminiſhed heads! and read in a *Barbarian* * writer a finer paſſage than any of you ever wrote.

On the text of this paſſage there is little room for critical remarks, except on the word נעשה *faciamus, Let us make:* better *Make we.* It is aſked if the uſe of a plural verb here imply a plurality of Gods, or at leaſt a plurality of perſons in the God-head? to ſpeak the language of the ſchools. This is partly a grammatical queſtion; and it has been remarked in the explanatory note, that the generality of Chriſtian interpreters have conſidered the words addreſſed to JESUS CHRIST, the ſecond perſon of the Trinity, in his pre-exiſting ſtate. Why they might not make him as well addreſs himſelf to the THIRD PERSON too, I cannot well conceive †: for there is nothing in the word that can reſtrain its meaning to one, two, or twenty. It is but juſt however to hear what they ſay; and the eloquent Chryſoſtom ſhall here ſpeak for them all. "God "ſaid: *Let us make man,* &c. Let us here interrogate a Jew, and ſee what anſwer he will give "to theſe words: for theſe words were written by Moſes, whom they profeſs to believe. To

* The Greeks were wont to call all other nations *Barbarians.*

† This is indeed done by Severianus Gabalenſis and ſome others. So Vatable: "Plurali numero utitur Moſes, ut "ſignificaret plures ſubeſſe in Deo perſonas; et Patrem, in creatione hominis, advocaſſe in conſilium ſapientiam ſuam, "et virtutem ſive ſpiritum."—And Mr. Biddle, the father of the Engliſh Unitarians, conſiders the words as addreſſed to the *Holy Spirit,* excluſively of the Son. See his Life by Toulmin, p. 41.

"whom

" whom then was it ſaid: *Let us make man?* To ſome angel or archangel (ſay they).—Mad-
" neſs! impudence in the extreme! For how can it agree with reaſon, that an angel ſhould
" be conſulted by his Lord, a creature by his Creator? The province of an angel is to attend
" and miniſter, not to give counſel. Learn this from the ſublime Iſaiah: *I ſaw*, ſays he,
" *cherubim and ſeraphim ſtanding at the right hand of God; and with their wings they covered*
" *their faces*, &c. plainly intimating that they could not bear the ſplendour of divine majeſty;
" and therefore they ſtood fearful and trembling—for what *elſe* could creatures do?—Who
" then was he, to whom God ſaid: *Let us make man?* Who elſe but HE, the Angel of the great
" council, the Wonderful counſellor, the Mighty one, the Prince of peace, the Father of the
" future age, the only-begotten SON of GOD, the equal to his Father in eſſence, by whom all
" things were made—To HIM it was ſaid: *Let us make man.* Here (continues he) a mortal
" ſtab is given to Arianiſm. God ſaith not, imperatively: *Make thou*, as to a ſubject or inferior;
" but, with co-equal honour: *Let us make—Let us make after our own image*; clearly intimating
" a co-eſſentiality." Chryſoſt. Hom. viii. in Geneſ. It would be hard, I think, for either Jew or Arian to ſupport their reſpective opinions with more ingenuity or eloquence; whatever may be the ſolidity of the good Father's argument.

Of the Jewiſh writers, ſome are of opinion, that God here addreſſes himſelf to his ſurrounding angels, as a King to his council of ſtate; and R. Solomon Jarhi thinks this opinion ſupported by a paſſage in 1 Kings 22. 19, where Michaiah ſays to Ahab: " I ſaw the Lord ſitting
" on his throne; and the whole heavenly hoſt ſtanding by him," &c.—This, at leaſt, is a very old opinion. It was that of Philo, who probably borrowed it from Plato. Others, with whom agree ſome of our beſt modern critical commentators, find in *Let us make* no more than an emphatical and majeſtic mode of expreſſion; inſinuating both the *power* of the Creator, and the *dignity* of the created. So Dathe: " Phraſis, *Faciamus hominem*, a multis interpretibus ad
" pluritatem perſonarum in Deo probandum adhibetur: ſed perperam. Eſt anthropopathica
" locutio; qua indicatur *dignitas hominis* a Deo creandi; quem dominum rerum omnium ſa-
" cere volebat .... Sic enim ſolent homines, in rebus gravioribus gerendis et conſtituendis,
" agere." Of the ſame ſentiment are Zachariæ, Scheide, Schulſe, Jeruſalem, &c.

As a critic, I will only ſay: That the word נעשה does not neceſſarily imply a plurality, any more than אלהים, בוראים, אדונים; and I believe, that it is found even in the Hebrew writings applied to a ſingle mortal: namely, Song of Sol. 1. 11. תורי זהב נעשה לך " *We will make* for
" thee a collar of gold." Where I am perſuaded, that *we* means only Solomon himſelf; as in ver. 4. " *We will run* after thee, is only applicable to his beloved fair-one. So again, in the ſame verſe: " We will be glad"—" We will remember." So alſo, ch. 8. 8. " *We have* a little
" ſiſter:" and in ſeveral other places of this admirable poem the plural is uſed for the ſingular. Nor is it peculiar to the Hebrew. It is quite familiar to the Arabs. The Muſſulmans are certainly no Trinitarians: yet nothing is more common in the Koran than God's ſpeaking in the plural number. *We did—we gave—we commanded.* The ſame phraſeology has prevailed in the weſtern nations: and *nos*, *noi*, *nous* and *we*, are continually in the mouths of the great men of the earth. I am therefore ſtrongly inclined to think with the writers above mentioned, that the נעשה of Geneſis implies no plurality of perſons.—At any rate, I would ſay to thoſe who imagine that they find here an argument in favour of the *Trinity*, what our Cartwright ſaid

ſaid near two hundred years ago—" Non mihi hujuſmodi locis ad impugnandum adverſarium " inniti, ſat tutum videtur."—But ſee the remark on ch. 3. 22.

Thoſe who have thought that נעשה is in the paſſive, and ſhould be rendered: *Let* man *be made*, are deſervedly laughed at by Aben-Ezrah.

Ib. *After our own image.* בצלמנו. The Greek tranſlator ſeems to have read with a *chaph*; and ſo probably read S. Jerom.

Ib. *And according to our own likeneſs.* וכדמותנו. For ſo Sam. with the copulative; which here ſeems neceſſary. Some MSS. and the antient edition of Breſcia (1494) have *chaph* inſtead of *beth*. It is of little importance, which be read: although I am inclined to think there was originally either a ב or a כ before both the words.

Ib. *And all the wild beaſts.* Lit. *animals of the earth.* I have preferred the reading of the Syriac. Houbigant ſaw the awkwardneſs of the preſent text; but would not attend to Le Clerc's ſuſpicion; probably becauſe it was Le Clerc's. " Suſpicabatur Clericus legendum ובכל חית הארץ. " Conſultius בכל הארץ, animantia quæ ſunt *in omni terra*." But this conjectural emendation, although ſupported by an old edition of Venice, is ſurely not a happy one. It is remarkable that Canonico's MS. has *των θηριων της γης*, but placed before *και των κτεινων*.

Ver. 28. *Subdue it.* Read כבשה with Sam. and 16 MSS.

Ver. 30. *All ſorts of vegetables.* את כל ירק. This, I think, is evidently a reſumption; very common in every language; and here peculiarly emphatical. The copulative before את is therefore to be rejected; although it be in Sep. Arab. ſome copies of Chald. and in 15 Heb. MSS. De Roſſi juſtly remarks, that the Latin verſion of the Sam. text, in the Polyglott, *omne quoque*, is not agreeable to the original; in which there is nothing equivalent to *quoque*. Neither Aquila, nor Theodotion, nor Symmachus reads the copulative.

Ver. 31. The great work is done: the creation accompliſhed:—and the divine architect, reviewing his work, finds every thing, every part, according to his mind; every thing in that degree of excellence which he meant to give it. " Thus it was; when God, reviewing all that " he had made, ſaw it to be excellent."

CHAP. II.

Ver. 1. HOW this and the following verſes came to be disjoined from chap. 1. is not eaſily accounted for. It is a proof, at leaſt, that he or they, who made the preſent diviſion, either made it very careleſsly, or had very little diſcernment.

Six days have now elapſed; and the ſeventh has dawned: but, there is nothing further to be done. " For the heavens and the earth, with all their hoſts, were complete." The primary idea of the word צבא, rendered *hoſts*, ſeems to be *decor*, *ornamentum*; the beautiful and regular order and arrangement of things. Hence it is here well rendered by the Greek tranſlator *κοσμος*, and by Jerom *ornatus*. See the explanatory note.

Ver. 2. *On the ſixth day.* ביום הששי. The obſtinacy with which ſome ſticklers for the integrity of the Maſoretic Hebrew Text ſtill defend the reading ביום השביעי on " the ſeventh " day," is to me aſtoniſhing. Certain I am, that if this laſt reading had been found in the Samaritan

Samaritan copy, and the other in the Jewiſh copy, corroborated by the two moſt antient verſions, the Greek and Syriac; we ſhould hear thoſe critics triumphantly exalting the Maſoretic Text, and pointing out with great ingenuity the inconſiſtency of the Samaritan. In fact, the inconſiſtency of the preſent reading is apparent, at the very firſt ſight: elſe, why labour to reconcile it with the context? After all, it is but a poor expedient to tranſlate, for that purpoſe, *he had completed:* for ſtill the prepoſition ב determines him to have completed *on*, or *in the ſeventh day:* whereas to give a congruous meaning it ſhould be *before* the ſeventh day: which ב, I apprehend, never ſignifies; eſpecially when it relates to time. The only example, given by Noldius, is from this very conteſted paſſage; and conſequently a begging of the queſtion. The other inſtances are by no means appoſite, as Tympius ſeems willing to own; although he tries to bolſter up the preſent one thus: "Abſolverat autem Deus *in* die ſeptimo: h. e. in ipſis "diei ſeptimi et ſabbati auſpiciis, a ſole diei ſexti occumbente repetendis, omne opus ſuum "jam ad finem perduxerat."—Mirum hoc, mi Tympi! Even Dathe, which I more wonder at, thinks the preſent reading defenſible.—A contraſt of the two days is here naturally expected; and the context ſeems ſo abſolutely to require it, that I have known ſeveral perſons, who knew nothing of the originals, aſk with anxiety, if the word *ſeventh* were not an errour of the preſs? —The ſame contraſt is obſervable Exod. 20. 11. "For in *ſix* days God made, &c. but on the "*ſeventh* day," &c.—In ſhort, every good argument is in favour of the Samaritan; not even a plauſible one in favour of the Maſoretic lection.—The Maſoretic lection, however, is an antient errour; as it is followed by Onkelos, the Thargums, Jerom and both Arabs. But it is not ſo old as Joſephus; who ſays expreſsly, that God made every thing in the ſpace of *ſix days*, και τον κοσμον εν εξ ταις ταισαις ἡμεραις Μωυσης, και ταυτα τα εν αυτῳ φησι γενεσθαι. It will be ſaid, perhaps, that he copied from the Septuagint; but this is not probable: and at any rate the reading of the Septuagint muſt have been deemed the right one by the Jews of his time.

A queſtion here occurs, whether by each of the ſix days, above mentioned, is meant a natural day of twenty-four hours; or ſome other longer period, called, accommodatively, a *day*? Some modern world-makers, to give themſelves room for a ſlow, progreſſive creation, make *one day* a period of 1000 years. Why not as well ten thouſand, or a million?

More ingenious is the idea of Philo, who thought that the whole hiſtory of the creation was to be underſtood allegorically; and calls it a vulgar ſimplicity to imagine, that the world was really made in the ſpace of ſix days: Ευηθες παυυ το οιεσθαι ἐξ ἡμεραις, η καθολου χρονου, κοσμον γεγονεναι. Coſmop. l. 1. tom. 1. p. 123. This agrees with what ſeems to have been a common opinion in the days of Origen: and might be plauſibly defended, from the genius of the oriental ſtyle.—However this be, plain it is that the Hebrew writer, whether he divided his creation into days for the ſake of a certain order, as I really think he did; or believed that things happened literally as he relates them; his *day* and *night* cannot be any other than a common day, or ἡμερονυκτιον of twenty-four hours. At every other acceptation grammar and ſenſe revolt.

Ver. 3. *God therefore bleſſed the ſeventh day*, &c.—I had at firſt rendered ברך *hath bleſſed*, referring it to the inſtitution of the Sabbath, which I am perſuaded the coſmologiſt had in view: but as the word not only admits the direct and definite præterite, but to ſome has ſeemed to require it; I have altered my verſion, without altering my opinion. For I ſtill think, that the *vau* here is equivalent to על־כן; and is rather an inference drawn by the narrator,

than

than a part of the narrative. Three arguments are chiefly urged in favour of the latter opinion. The firſt is derived from the very general notion, which prevailed among the Pagan nations, of the ſeventh day being in ſome ſort ſacred: for whence, it is aſked, could this notion ariſe, but from a traditional belief, that the Sabbath was of divine inſtitution, and its obſervance coeval with the world?—To prove the firſt part of the propoſition, quotations have been heaped on quotations from Heſiod and Homer down to Menaſſèh Ben-Iſrael *. But, ſuppoſing them all to be clear, conſiſtent, and unequivocal teſtimonies, which they certainly are not; there does not reſult from them a proof, that the *hebdomadal* day, to which they refer, had any connection with the Jewiſh Sabbath; or, if it had, that it was not poſterior to the Moſaical inſtitution, and might not be borrowed from it.

It is urged, ſecondly, that it has ever been the opinion of the Thalmudical and other Jewiſh writers, that the precept of keeping the Sabbath was from the beginning obligatory, and obſerved by the Patriarchs. Nay, ſay ſome, this is deducible from ſeveral texts of ſcripture; ſuch as Gen. 8. 4.—10. 12.—29. 27. but eſpecially from Exod. 16. 23, where Moſes ſpeaks of the Sabbath, as a known obſervance; and only forbids the gathering of manna on it.

To an opinion of the Thalmudiſts, and more modern Jewiſh interpreters, I am not diſpoſed, in matters of criticiſm, to pay much regard, were it not only commonly but univerſally taught by them: but, in truth, ſome of their beſt commentators, ſuch as R. Iſmael, R. Iſaac, R. Nathan, and R. S. Jarhi, teach the contrary. The words of the laſt, commenting on the very paſſage in queſtion, are too remarkable not to be here tranſcribed, ברכו במן׳ שכל יומות השבוע יורד להם עומר לגלגלת׳ ובששי לחם משנה· וקדשו במן׳ שלא ירד כלל· והמקרא כתוב על העתיר "He "bleſſed and ſanctified it (the ſeventh day) by the manna; of which although, on the other "days of the week, an omer fell to every perſon, and double that quantity on the ſixth day; "there fell none at all on the ſeventh: By the *manna* then he ſanctified it: and what is HERE "written, is to be underſtood of what was to happen *afterwards*."

As to the quotations from ſcripture, they only ſhew to what ſtraits they are reduced for want of arguments, who employ ſuch feeble ones.—In the firſt, God ſays to Noah: "Yet ſeven "days, and I will bring a deluge upon the earth."—In the two next it is related, that Noah waited "ſeven days," and "yet other ſeven days." Therefore, it ſhould ſeem that the obſervance of the Sabbath was prior to the Moſaical inſtitution. Strange inference this! From the third text we learn, indeed, that the marriage feſtival laſted a week, or ſeven days, in Syria, at the time of Jacob's ſojourning there: but what relation has that to the Jewiſh Sabbath?

Somewhat more ſpecious, though not more ſolid, is the argument drawn from Exodus. It is not there ſaid, that the ſeventh day was now, for the firſt time, ſanctified: the Iſraelites are only ordered to gather no manna on it.—Very well! This order is, itſelf, the firſt intimation of a ſabbatical inſtitution; completely ſanctioned afterwards by the Decalogue. If the ſabbatical obſervance had been prior to this event, it would have been unneceſſary to caution them againſt gathering manna on it. So far were even the rulers of the people from having any notion of a prior Sabbath, that they appear not *now* to have ſufficiently comprehended it. For

* Which the reader, if he pleaſe, may ſee in Selden, Spencer, Calmet; or in Ikenius's more recent *Diſſertatio de inſtitutis et ceremoniis legis Moſaicæ, ante Moſem.*

we

we find them, ver. 22, coming in ſeeming ſurpriſe to tell Moſes what the people had done. The anſwer of Moſes is, I think, deciſive for the novelty of the inſtitution: "This," ſays he, "is "what the Lord hath ordered: To-morrow is a ſabbath of reſt, holy to the Lord." Exod. 16. 23. Again, ver. 25, 26. "Eat it to-day: for, this day being a ſabbath to the Lord, ye ſhall "not find it in the fields. Six days ſhall ye gather it: for, on the ſeventh day (it being the "Sabbath) there ſhall none be found."—Notwithſtanding theſe repeated injunctions, ſome of the people, ver. 27, went out to ſeek manna on the ſeventh day: upon which the Lord expoſtulates thus with Moſes: "How long refuſe ye to keep my commandments and my laws? "See now, becauſe the Lord hath appointed to you a ſabbath, he therefore giveth you, on the "ſixth day, the bread of two days. Abide ye, every one in his own place; let no one go out "of his own place, the ſeventh day." So on the ſeventh *day*, ſubjoins the hiſtorian, the *people reſted*, or kept the ſabbath.

Let the unbiaſſed reader now ſay, if it be not clear from this very text, which is brought to ſupport the contrary, that the Iſraelites had no conception of a ſabbatical precept before this period. Indeed, it is incredible, that, if ſuch a precept had before exiſted, there ſhould be no mention of its obſervance in the lives of the Patriarchs, either before or after the deluge. We often read of their ſacrifices, never of their ſabbaths.

The only rational argument that can be urged againſt this hypotheſis is a grammatical one; which I ſhall give in the words of Dathe: "Equidem non dubito aſſentiri eis, qui poſteriorem "ſententiam (Deum ſtatim in principio rerum humanarum legem de Sabbato ſanxiſſe) defen-"dunt. Nam ſi prior locum haberet; ſi Moſes legem ſuam commendare Iſraelitis voluiſſet; "profecto ſua verba non conjunxiſſet per copulam *vau*; ut reliqua totius narrationis connec-"tuntur; ſed diſtinxiſſet ea per particulam על כן *propterea*; uti cap. ii. 24, et Exod. xx. 3, hac "ipſa de re egens."

Here is a real argument, expreſſed with elegance and preciſion: and I confeſs that I once thought it nearly concluſive. But on a more cloſe inveſtigation, and conſequently a more comprehenſive view of the matter, I have been led to change my opinion, for the following reaſons:

It ſeems to be granted, that if inſtead of *vau* there were an על כן before ברך, as there is in Exod. 20. 11, there would be no force in the objection. If then it can be ſhewn that *vau* has in circumſtances exactly or nearly ſimilar a meaning equipollent to that of על־כן, the balance of probability will be at leaſt equally poiſed: and there are other conſiderations, I ween, that will make my ſcale preponderate.

That ו hath often the ſame meaning with על־כן, *therefore*, cannot be queſtioned: for, although a great many of Noldius's inſtances ought to be retrenched, as otherwiſe reſolvable, there are evidently ſome in which the ו can hardly have any other meaning; and where the mode of phraſing is almoſt the ſame as here. Thus Iſaiah 44. 4. "Becauſe thou art precious in mine "eyes, &c. *therefore* will I give ואתן."—Pſ. 81. 12, 13. "My people would not hear my "voice, *therefore* I abandoned them, ואשלחהו." See alſo Gen. 29. 33.—30. 13. Exod. 3. 8. Levit. 19. 27.—20. 23. Numb. 31. 50. Deut. 4. 37.—7. 11.—18. 48. In general, wherever the *vau* has a manifeſt reference to any of the following particles כי. כן. על־כן. אשר. מאשר. יען־אשר. יען. תחת־אשר. and the like, it is always to be conſidered as an *illative*, rather than a

mere *copulative* conjunction. There is but one thing, I preſume, that can be objected to the above examples; namely, that, in them, the correſponding *cauſative* particle precedes *vau* in the text: whereas, in the paſſage before us, it follows. But I can produce examples that obviate even this objection. Levit. 11, 45. "I, the Lord, am your God, who brought you out "of the land of Egypt, to be a God to you: Ye ſhall *therefore* be holy, *becauſe* I am holy." והייתם קדשים כי קדוש אני. Again, chap. 20. 7. "*Wherefore* be ye holy, *becauſe* I, the Lord, "am your God." See alſo ver. 26. and Numb. 19. 13.

Let me add, that the עליך of Exodus 20. 11, inſtead of militating againſt this explication, appears greatly to corroborate it. For, there, an evident alluſion is made to the ſabbath ſo recently inſtituted, and the reaſon of the inſtitution aſſigned. The third verſe of the ſecond chapter of Geneſis, then, moſt probably alludes to the ſame inſtitution, becauſe the ſame reaſon is aſſigned.—So that, on the whole, I cannot but think with Jarhi, Selden, Le Clerc, &c. that the Jewiſh hiſtorian here, as often elſewhere, makes uſe of a *prolepſis*; and alludes to the Moſaical inſtitution of the ſabbath.

But whether the words be accounted a part of the narrative, or the inference of the writer, it is clear to me, that they were purpoſely inſerted as a powerful motive to obſerve the ſabbath day: one of the great points which the author had in view, when he compoſed his coſmogony.

For, now, to retrace our ſteps, and take a retroſpective view of this whole ſcheme of creation, as related in the firſt chapter of Geneſis, we can hardly avoid ſeeing, that *deſign*, premeditated *deſign*, characteriſes every part of it: and that of all the coſmogonies that could be deviſed, it is the beſt calculated to impreſs on the minds of a groſs, carnal people, the great truths which its compoſer meant to inculcate; and to enforce obedience to laws and rites, principally founded on thoſe truths.

Do I believe, then, that the narrative of Geneſis is not a literally true narration? or that it is in all, or many of its parts, a pure allegory? I believe, neither the one nor the other: I believe it to be a moſt beautiful *mythos*, or philoſophical fiction, contrived with great wiſdom, dreſſed up in the garb of real hiſtory, adapted, as I have ſaid, to the ſhallow intellects of a rude barbarous nation; and perfectly well calculated for the great and good purpoſes for which it was contrived; namely, to eſtabliſh the belief of one ſupreme God and Creator, in oppoſition to the various and wild ſyſtems of idolatry which then prevailed; and to enforce the obſervance of a periodical day, to be chiefly devoted to the ſervice of that Creator, and the ſolacing repoſe of his creatures.

In fact, what ſtronger motive could be urged to preſerve a people from idolatry, than by ſhewing, in ſo minute a detail, that all the worſhip-objects of the ſurrounding nations were themſelves but mere creatures, the great celeſtial luminaries (moſt probably the firſt objects of adoration) not excepted?

He had, no doubt, particularly in view the idolatry of Egypt; where, as Boſſuet elegantly ſays, "Tout étoit Dieu, excepté Dieu même: et cette TERRE, qu'il avoit fait, pour y mani-"feſter ſa gloire, ſembloit être devenue un TEMPLE d'Idoles *." Beſide the ſun, moon and

* Dr. Blair has, in one of his ſermons, literally tranſlated this fine paſſage from Boſſuet's *Diſcours ſur l'Hiſtoire Univerſelle*; with the addition, I think, of a ſingle word; which adds nothing to the beauty of the original.

ſtars,

ſtars, they adored the fiſhes of the ſea, the birds of the air, the animals of the earth, and even the herbs of the field, radiſhes, leeks and onions.

O ſanctas gentes! quibus hæc naſcuntur in hortis
Numina!

It was then of the utmoſt importance to perſuade the Iſraelites, who had, during their ſtay in Egypt, been more or leſs contaminated by thoſe idolatrous rites, that every plant of the field, fiſh of the ſea, bird of the air, and beaſt of the earth; the whole viſible world, in ſhort, was the production of a ſuperior BEING, to whom alone divine worſhip could be due. In particulariſing the greater quadrupeds הבהמה, and the great ſea-monſters התנים, I have no doubt that he alluded, in the former, to the worſhip of *Apis* in the form of a *bull* *; and in the latter to the *crocodile*; which in ſome parts of Egypt was held in the greateſt veneration.

Had our coſmologiſt ſpoken the language of metaphyſical divinity, or held forth the allegorical reveries of Philo—if he had repreſented the Creator of the world as a pure intellectual MIND, a ſpirit eternal, infinite, incomprehenſible, who by a ſingle *fiat*, or rather a ſingle *voluit*, inſtantaneouſly, and out of nothing, produced this whole viſible creation; his people would not have underſtood him; they would not have liſtened to him. There was nothing here to arreſt their attention, nothing to lay hold on their ſenſes, nothing ſuited to their ſhallow intellects. But, by deſcribing the CREATOR of the world, as a BEING of greater power indeed, but ſtill a CREATOR reſembling other artiſts; a CREATOR according to the image and likeneſs of man †, by giving him rude materials to work upon, and a ſeries of time in which to work—by making him work only by day, and repoſe by night; juſt as, when "the ſun "ariſeth, man goeth forth to his work, and to his labour, until the evening:" Pſ. 104. al. 103. —by making him, at every pauſe, review his work, and pronounce it to be good—by preſenting a continued, progreſſive ſcene of darkneſs gradually diſpelled by increaſing *light*, waters evaporated or diſperſed into lakes and ſeas, theſe ſwarming with fiſhes and other reptiles, a rapid vegetation taking place on the new-dried earth, the luminaries of the heavens diſplayed in all their ſplendour, the fertile ſoil animated into living creatures of every kind; and man, imperial man, formed by the hands of God himſelf—he offered nothing to their belief, at which the ſenſes could recoil, nothing which their comprehenſion could not graſp. They muſt, themſelves, have often ſeen, on a ſmall ſcale, a part of the great ſcene laid here before them. They muſt have ſeen tracts of land, completely covered with water, and unfit for vegetation, become by evaporation, or draining, the moſt fertile ſpots—they muſt have ſeen whole days of miſty darkneſs gradually diſpelled, and ſucceeded by glorious ſun-ſhine ‡—they muſt have ſeen the wonderful rapidity of vegetation in many inſtances; even in leſs time than is allowed to it by the Hebrew coſmologiſt—they muſt have ſeen, particularly in Egypt, the

* From which the Iſraelites, in the wilderneſs, took the idea of their *golden calf*.

† For, if man be made after the image and likeneſs of God, the latter muſt neceſſarily have ſome ſemblance of man.

‡ It is remarkable that the great darkneſs, which prevailed in Egypt, is ſaid to have laſted juſt three days, the ſame period of time that was required to diſpel entirely that primeval darkneſs which covered the face of the deep: and, perhaps, we ſhall not find in Hiſtory a darkneſs mentioned, that laſted more than that time.

waters ſwarming with fiſh, and the ſoil ſwarming with animals, or animalcules, which ſeemed to riſe out of the fertiliſed clods; and although they had never ſeen the largeſt animals generated in that manner, they might have naturally enough ſuppoſed them to have had a ſimilar origin. Spontaneous generation was, moſt probably, believed by them, as well as by moſt other nations: and the banks of the Nile were celebrated for that ſpecies of fecundity. See Ovid's beautiful deſcription of reanimated nature after the deluge. Metam. l. 1. v. 416. Even in the narration of the Hebrew writer, it is the water and the earth that are ſaid to be the immediate productors of fiſh and animals, although that productive power is communicated to them by the Deity.

As to man, he is not produced in that manner, for a very apparent reaſon: namely, to give him a greater degree of dignity, as being formed, indeed, out of the ſame earth with the other animals, but formed directly and immediately by the hand of God, and animated by the *breath* of his mouth: hence, and from the dominion imparted to him over the earth and its contents, he is ſaid to be made according to the image and likeneſs of God himſelf.—A wiſer ſyſtem of coſmogony could not, certainly, be imagined: and I doubt much if Alphonſus *, with all his mathematical and aſtronomical ſkill, could have framed ſo good a one; or, at leaſt, one that would have been ſo much reliſhed by the people to whom it was addreſſed. Every thing in it bears teſtimony to the great ſagacity, and deep knowledge of mankind, of the ſapient inventor. The very circumſtance of making God ſpeak, as well as act, in a manner ſuited to the conceptions of the Hebrew nation; and ſpeaking in their own rude uncultivated dialect, was an admirable device to gain attention to his narrative, and reſpect to his theory. God ſpeaking pure Hebrew, in the very creation of the world, and ever after communicating his will in that tongue, could not fail of inſpiring them with high ideas of their language as well as of their laws; and of making them conſider both as peculiarly ſacred.

Another end which the coſmologiſt had in view, when he diſtributed the work of creation into ſix days, followed by a day of repoſe, was evidently to enforce the obſervance of a weekly Sabbath; a moſt excellent and humane inſtitution; on two accounts: firſt, as a day of religious worſhip "holy to the Lord;" and ſecondly, as a day of ſolacing repoſe to the human, and even to the brute creation. On that bleſſed day, the neck of the noble ſteer bended not under the galling yoke; the patient camel carried not, through the ſandy ſcorching deſert, its grievous load; the mule felt neither the weight nor goad of its rider; and the ill-treated, uſeful, aſs was, for a day, delivered of its unequal burthen. The man-ſlave and the maid-ſlave were, with reſpect to labour, during that day, on the ſame footing with the children of the family, with the maſter himſelf; diſtinction of rank ſeemed for a while ſuſpended, and equal reſt and feſtal joy were common to all.

But could any motive be more powerful to recommend and enforce this wiſe benevolent inſtitution, than to make the Divinity himſelf obſerve it after the creation of his work?—Indeed it required a not leſs powerful motive. The ſordid intereſts of man, his greedineſs of

* Alphonſus X. king of Caſtile, the greateſt aſtronomer of his day, was wont to ſay, that if God had conſulted him in the formation of the world (alluding no doubt to the Hebrew coſmogony), he could have given him ſome good advice.

gain,

gain, and inſatiable avarice, are not eaſily reſtrained by ordinary inducements: and we find that, in ſpite of God's *example*, and *command*, ſabbath-breaking was no uncommon tranſgreſſion among the Hebrew people.

I have now fairly and candidly delivered my opinion of the nature and purport of the Hebrew coſmogony, comprehended in the firſt chapter of the book of Geneſis and a few verſes of the ſecond. But I ſet not up for a dogmatiſt. I have read much on the ſubject. I have long revolved it in my mind, and placed it in every poſſible point of view. I have not drawn my concluſions with precipitation; nor till after a very ſerious and minute inveſtigation: and the reſult is what you have been juſt now reading.

——Si quid noviſti rectius iſtis,
Candidus imperti; ſi non, his utere mecum.

From what I have ſaid, the reader muſt not imagine that my opinion is peculiar to myſelf. Some of the firſt ſcholars and critics of the age think very little differently. I ſhall name only the celebrated Eichhorn, who has in the ivth vol. of his Biblical Repertory expreſsly and learnedly treated on the ſubject; and to whoſe ſentiments, in general, I willingly ſubſcribe; although from him I did not borrow mine. But that the curious reader may know where he can find what has been written on the other ſide, I will point out to him the following works: Rau's Programma 'De fictione Moſaica falſo adſerta;' the elder Roſenmüller's 'Antiquiſſima telluris hiſtoria a Moſe deſcripta.' And Doederleen's 'Inſtitutes of Chriſtian divinity:'—or, if theſe volumes be not at hand, he may read what Dathe and Roſenmüller the ſon have ſaid; the former in his tranſlation of the Pentateuch; the latter in his firſt vol. of 'Scholia.'

I haſten to the ſecond chapter; which is, at preſent, pretty generally ſuppoſed to be another coſmogonical fragment, written by a different perſon, and inſerted by Moſes in his commentaries as a curious piece of antiquity. I confeſs I have never been able to view it in that light: after all the pains that Aſtruc, Eichhorn and others have taken to prove the diverſity, I can find nothing in it but a natural reſumption of the ſubject, by the ſame pen which wrote the firſt chapter; and with the ſame wiſe, political and religious views. As I have given in my preface to the Pentateuch a table of all the paſſages which, according to Eichhorn, belong to the writer of this ſuppoſed ſecond fragment; and as I have there declared my intention of diſcuſſing the ſubject at large in my general Preface; I ſhall here ſay no more of the matter; but endeavour to explain my text, as a critical commentator.

I have already obſerved, that the firſt ſix verſes of ch. 2. belong to the firſt, and are a comprehenſive ſummary of the foregoing narrative.—*Such*, ſays the author, (ver. 4.) *was the origin of thoſe heavens and this earth, on their being created; at what time the Lord God created the earth and the heavens.* There is, in the laſt member of this verſe, a various reading, which was unintentionally omitted in my firſt vol. p. 4. namely, The Sam. Text and Verſion, the Greek, Syriac and Vulgate have, inſtead of *the earth and the heavens, the heavens and the earth*, in the ſame order as juſt before; and this reading is preferred by Houbigant, and followed by Michaelis and Dathe: yet I am inclined to think that the Hebrew Text, with Onkelos, the Thargums, both Arabs, and the Perſic, have the original reading; and that the other

other was firſt introduced to make it tally with the foregoing member, and with ver. 1. of ch. 1. If this be allowed, I think it is another proof that the coſmologiſt meant to confine his narrative merely to the ſix days creation; and that the *heavens* of ch. 1. ver. 1. were not prior heavens, but the heavens that became viſible at the time of the ſix days creation: namely, that wide expanſe mentioned ch. 1. ver. 8. and which is expreſsly denominated *the heavens*.

Ver. 5. *Hitherto*, continues he, *neither plant nor herb of the field exiſted, nor could grow upon the earth: for the Lord God had yet cauſed no rain to fall upon the earth, nor were there men to till the ground: but a flood, riſing out of the earth, drenched the whole face of the ground.*—The only remark which I have here to make is, that the word which I render *flood*, אד, has been by moſt modern tranſlators rendered a *vapour* or *cloud:* moſt erroneouſly, in my opinion; and in deſpite of the context. For it is evidently the intention of the writer to depict the ſtate of the earth before the ſix days creation; when it was incapable of producing either plant or herb; which could not grow while the earth was covered with water, when no ſalutary ſhowers had yet moiſtened the thirſty ſoil; and when men exiſted not to till it. The word אד then muſt neceſſarily denote that efflux of water, which, iſſuing from the boſom of the then unfaſhioned earth, covered its whole ſurface; and which is juſtly called the *deep*. Whereas if a *vapour* or *miſty cloud* had only watered the face of the ground, it would have been equally ſerviceable as a rain to make the earth vegetate.

The truth is, all the antient interpreters underſtood the word properly, although they have not all rendered it by the beſt terms in their reſpective languages. The Greek Sep. has πηγη, followed by the Vulgate, *fons:* and both theſe terms are admiſſible in their ſtronger ſignification; that is, in the ſame ſenſe in which they are uſed ch. 7. ver. 11., where *the fountains of the great deep* are ſaid to have been broken up: but ſtill the Greek word uſed by Aquila επιβλυγμος *, or επιβλυσμος, and the Syr. מבועא (which ought to be rendered not *fons*, as in the Polyglott, but *ſcaturigo*) are far more ſuitable.—Onkelos, indeed, has ענגא a *cloud*; and both Arabs, as they are now pointed, have a word that denotes *vapour:* but I ſuſpect that the right reading is בחאר, not בהאר; and then it would coincide with Syr. and Aq.: and be conſiſtent not only with the context, but with ch. 1. ver. 2., where a word from the ſame root is uſed, by Saadias, to denote the earth's being *immerſed in water* †.—However this be, certain, to me, it is that אד never ſignifies *vapour*. It occurs but twenty-ſix times in the whole Hebrew Scripture; and, in twenty-four of theſe, it is allowed to ſignify ſome great and *ſudden calamity*, *deſtruction*, and the like. Theſe are, doubtleſs, metaphorical meanings, and are, indeed, chiefly found in poetical compoſition: but ſurely ſuch a metaphor could never be derived from a *vapour* or *miſt*. It might be drawn from the *burſting* of a watery cloud, or the *burſting forth* of water from the earth; and this, I preſume, we ſhall find to be the literal and primitive meaning of אד. Let us compare it here with the only other place in which it has not a metaphorical meaning; although even there it includes a ſort of metaphor, namely Job 36. 27.

* There is a typographical error in Montfaucon, επιφλυγμος. It is probable that Aquila, who was extremely tenacious of the *letter*, every where tranſlated the Hebrew word in the ſame manner, even when it had a metaphorical application. See Prov. 1. 16.

† The Perſic tranſlator retained the Arabic word, and muſt ſtand or fall by it.—The Thargums follow Onkelos in their wild paraphraſtic manner.

The

The words of the original are, כי ינרע טיפי יזקו מטר לאידו, which our tranſlators render, " For he *maketh ſmall* drops of water; they pour down rain, according to the vapour thereof:" giving to נרע a meaning which it never hath; and to אד a meaning which it cannot have.—I ſay, they have given to נרע a meaning which it never has. I have carefully examined every paſſage in which it occurs; and can affirm, that it never means to *make ſmall* in the ſenſe here aſſigned to it. It may ſometimes be tranſlated to *diminiſh*, as, to *diminiſh* one's wages: but it never has the ſame meaning with *comminuere*, or to *make ſmall*. Its proper ſignification is to *reſtrain, keep back, withdraw;* and in this ſame chapter, ver. 7. it is fitly rendered in our public verſion by the laſt of thoſe terms: " he *withdraweth* not his eyes from the righteous." Why this ſhould not have led them to give it the ſame meaning in ver. 27., is only to be aſcribed to their implicitly following Montanus, who changed Pagninus's *probibebit* into *minuet:* for the French Geneva verſion, which they ſometimes followed, has very properly rendered *Quand il a ſouſtrait.* So the Chaldee paraphraſe ארום ימנע, and Jerom, but not ſo well, *qui aufert* *. The firſt comma, then, of ver. 27. muſt neceſſarily be rendered " when he *reſtraineth*, or, *hath reſtrained*, " the drops of water."—Let us now ſee what ſenſe can be made out of the laſt comma.

The ſagacious reader will, perhaps, anticipate the concluſion, and ſay, " The drops of water, " in conſequence of being reſtrained, will accumulate into a cloud, which cloud will at length " burſt, and produce a copious rain."—This is preciſely the caſe, as is expreſsly marked in the next following verſe. Whether, then, we read with the preſent text יזקו from זקק, or with 8 MSS. יוזקו from the Chal. זוק or זיק; and whether we adopt Houbigant's conjectural reading נאדיו for אדו; we muſt, in either caſe, exclude *vapour*; and, if we retain אד, tranſlate with Jerom, *gurges*; or, admitting נאידי, render it *bottles*; that is, ſwollen clouds; a metaphor elſewhere employed by the writer of the book of Job, ch. 38. 37.—In this latter ſuppoſition, אד will be out of the queſtion; in the former ſuppoſition, it will have the ſame meaning which it has in Geneſis; an *efflux* or *guſh* of water, emitted from a cloud.

Long as this remark has been, I cannot help concluding it with two quotations, the one from an antient, the other from a modern commentator. The former is Diodorus, in Theodoret; who, after citing the Septuagint verſion Πηγη δε, &c., adds: Λεγει μεν γαρ, ὁτι εκαλυπτετο πασα [ἡ γη] ὑπο των ὑδατων· ειρηκε δε ουτο ὡτω πως, ὡς αν εξ αυτης της γης ΒΛΥΖΟΝΤΑ τε και ΠΗΓΑΖΟΝΤΑ τα ὑδατα, και εξ απασης αυτης φερομενα ὡτω πασαν αυτην συνεκαλυπτον. In ſubſtance, " The meaning is, that waters *guſhing* out as it were in ſo many *ſprings*, from every part of the " earth, overflowed and entirely covered it."—Nor leſs clear and juſt is the interpretation of the acute and ſapient Oleaſter: " Ignota eſt Hebræis ſignificatio nominis אד; unde Chaldæus " vertit *nubem*, Sanctes *vaporem*, qui poſtquam in pluviam reſolvebatur. Sed mirum valde eſt, " illos ponere pluviam, antequam eſſet pluvia.... Vulgatus interpres verius *fontem* arbitratur. " Qui *vaporem* aut *nubem* ſignificare putant, ex illo Job 36. 27. occaſionem ſumpſerunt. Sed, " meo judicio, unica eſt nominis ſignificatio, ſcilicet *inundatio*; quæ convenit omnibus locis in " quibus nomen ponitur †. Illud autem Job citatum ſic reddendum eſt, *effundent nubes pluviam* " *ad inundationem ejus.* Unde hic (Geneſ. 2. 6.) vertendum puto: *Sed inundatio aſcendebat*

* The Greek and Syr. muſt have read a different word. See C. B. on the place.

† He means in its metaphorical meaning: for every ſudden *calamity* may fitly be termed an *inundation* of evils.

" *de*

" *de terra, et rigare faciebat omnem faciem terræ.* Neque intelligas unicum fontem de terra " aſcendiſſe; ſed, Hebraico more, *inundationem* pro *inundationes* ponit."

Nothing, I think, can be more accurate than this explanation. May we not hope, then, to ſee no more *a vapour* in this paſſage?

Our coſmologiſt having, in the firſt chapter, traced, with a rapid but ſkilful hand, the whole plan of creation, reſumes a part of his ſubject, and gives a more particular account of the creation of man. Here we ſtill diſcover the wiſe and artful mythologiſt. He had already told us that man was made after the ſemblance and image of God, and that he was made *male* and *female:* but he had not told us how, or of what materials. The materials, he now tells us, were the duſt of the ground; and that duſt, being animated by God's own breath, became a living perſon: firſt particularity in the creation of man, not mentioned in the former chapter.

We are then told, that an abode, ſuitable to man's dignity, had been previouſly prepared for him; a paradiſe, or garden of pleaſure, in which was every plant that could pleaſe the eye, or gratify the taſte; and in the midſt of the garden, a tree, called the " tree of life;" and another called the " tree of the knowledge of good and evil."—The fruit of this laſt tree man is forbidden to taſte, under pain of immediate death, or at leaſt of immediate mortality: but he may eat with freedom of all the reſt.—A convention of all the terreſtrial and aërial animals is now aſſembled by God, and preſented to Adam; to whom he ſagely gives appropriate appellations: but, in his ſurvey of their natures and qualities, he finds no animal like himſelf. God ſees his diſappointment and diſtreſs; pities his ſolitary condition; throws him into a deep ſleep; extracts one of his ribs, and faſhions it into the form of a woman. This beauteous form Adam, on awaking, views with rapture, acknowledges to be his own counterpart; and, informed (no doubt by God) whence ſhe had been taken, he exclaims: " This, now, is bone of my own bone, " and fleſh of my own fleſh! WOMAN let her be called; ſince out of MAN ſhe was taken."

Religious, but intelligent reader! wert thou to read all this in any book but the Bible, what wouldeſt thou think? Wouldeſt not thou think, and ſay, " It is a pretty poetical tale;" and rank it in thine own mind with the metamorphoſes of Ovid?—Well, let me aſk, What reaſon haſt thou to believe that it may not be a poetical tale, even in the Bible? Are there no ſuch tales there? Is every Bible-narrative literally true? He will be a hardy man, I think, who ſhall dare to affirm it.

We have already ſeen that not only the more learned of the Jews, but ſome of the moſt learned of the Chriſtian fathers, found it neceſſary, in their explanations of the Hexaemeron, to have recourſe to allegory in order to elude the ſtrong objections of their adverſaries againſt the Hebrew coſmogony. " Moſes, ſaid they, ſpeaks of a ſucceſſive ſix days work, to ſuit the " capacity of his people, and to give them a more diſtinct idea of every part of creation. It " is contrary to the notions which we have of Divine omnipotence, to ſay, that this is a literal hiſ- " torical narration, and that God left off, and reſumed, his labour, every evening and morning, " for ſix conſecutive days; and at length repoſed entirely on the ſeventh day. Such paſſages of " Scripture ought never to be taken in their literal meaning, but ſhould be conſidered as tro- " pological repreſentations."—Such is the language of Origen, ſuch the language of Auſtin, not to mention others of leſs learning and piety, who have either expreſſed their ſentiments in ſimilar terms, or laid down principles teeming with ſimilar concluſions. And although the contrary

contrary opinion, of the other fathers, has been generally followed by modern interpreters *, it is not for that the more defenſible, or more favourable to religion. For, better, ſurely, allegorize with Auſtin and Origen, than admit a literal explanation, which, if what we are taught to believe concerning the nature and attributes of God be true, muſt neceſſarily be falſe.

Both the fathers, juſt now mentioned, had to deal with acute and ſubtle adverſaries; Origen with Celſus, Auſtin with the Manicheans. They were unwilling to give up the inſpiration of the ſacred Books; but, as the objections preſſed hard upon them, in the ſuppoſition that the narration was to be literally underſtood, they were obliged to elude their force by having recourſe to allegory. "Who, ſays Origen, is ſuch a ſimpleton, ηλιθιος, as to imagine that God, "like a huſbandman, planted a Paradiſe in Eden; or planted in it a tree of life, a viſible and "palpable tree; ſo that he who ſhould, with his bodily teeth, eat of its fruit, ſhould receive "life; or that, eating of another tree, he ſhould acquire the knowledge of good and evil?— "No one, I think, will have any doubt, that theſe things, although apparently hiſtorical, are "tropically to be underſtood, and indicate certain myſteries: ουκ οιμαι δισταζειν τινα περι του αυτα "τροπικως δια δοκουσης ιστοριας και ου σωματικως γεγενημενης, μηνυειν τινα μυστηρια. Periarch. l. iv. "No. 16."—Severianus Gabalenſis, who bluſhes for the allegoriſts, and bids them bluſh (αισχυνεσθωσαν οι αλληγορουντες), and explains every part of the creation literally, takes another way to refute the objections made againſt it.—He abuſes the objectors; calls them blaſphemers, infidels, and other harſh names. Yet he is often puzzled with the facts; makes queries to himſelf which he cannot anſwer; and grants principles that deſtroy his own aſſertions. And this is the general method of the other fathers who follow his mode of interpretation.

My readers muſt not think, that, becauſe I admire the ingenuity of thoſe good fathers, in getting rid of troubleſome objections by taking refuge under the ſhield of allegory, I therefore am ſatisfied with their allegorical ſyſtem. I am altogether diſſatisfied with it; and have brought it forward only to ſhew the difficulties that attend the Hebrew coſmogony, conſidered as a real hiſtory: difficulties that appear to me unſurmountable.

But let it be once granted, that it is a mere poetical mythos, hiſtorically adapted to the ſenſes and intellects of a rude unphiloſophical people; every obſtacle will be removed, every objection obviated, every ſarcaſm repelled; whether it come from a Celſus or a Porphyry, a Julian or a Frederic, a Boulanger or a Bolingbroke.

What then, may we ſuppoſe, had the writer in view, when he compoſed this part of his mythology? He had in view, I conceive, two important points: to mortify the *pride* without depreſſing the *dignity* of man; and to inculcate the ſtrict and indiſſoluble union of man and woman in the matrimonial ſtate. "Man! (ſeems he to ſay) remember thine origin; thou waſt "formed of the duſt of the ground; be therefore humble: but, Man! remember alſo that that "duſt was animated by the *breath of God*, and after God's own likeneſs; debaſe not the divine "image by brutal actions."—Both theſe inferences are ſo well drawn by the eloquent Chryſoſtom, that I cannot refrain from abridging what he ſays, commenting on the paſſage, in his 12th homily on Geneſis. "What ſayeſt thou, Moſes! God, taking *duſt of the earth*, formed "man? Truly; not ſimply *earth*, (ſays he) but *duſt*, the moſt vile and lighteſt part of the

* Cajetan, Melchior Canus, and ſome others perhaps, are exceptions.

" earth!—If to this circumſtance we attend, a great leſſon of humility is preſented to us. For, " when we conſider whence our nature drew the firſt principle of its conſtitution, we check " every motion of pride, every haughty ſupercilious idea, were they to ariſe in thouſands! " We become humble, and learn modeſty, by reflecting on our original ſubſtance:" *ὁταν γαρ εννοησωμεν, ποθεν εσχε την αρχην της συστασεως ἡ Φυσις ἡ ἡμετερα, κἀν μυριακις τους οφρυς ανασπασωμεν, συστελλομεθα, ταπεινουμεθα, την ουσιαν ἑαυτων αναλογιζομενοι, μετριαζειν παιδευομεθα.*—On the other hand, learning " that man thus formed of duſt became a living perſon, by being inſpired " with the breath of life, by the mouth of God! we ought ever to bear in mind this noble pri- " vilege of ſoul; and never do any thing unworthy of it." *Ταυτα δε παντα εννοουντες, και λογιζομενοι την ενεργειαν της ἡμετερας ψυχης, μηδεν αναξιον αυτης διαπραττωμεθα.* With reſpect to the other point, it is clear that no argument could be more cogent, or conducive, to rivet the chains of marriage, and enforce the intimate union that ought to ſubſiſt between huſband and wife, than by making the firſt wife a part of her huſband's own body, and extracting her from his own ſide. Juſt, then, is the writer's concluſion: " Hence, a man ſhould leave even " his father and his mother, and cleave to his wife: for theſe two are but one fleſh."

There might be another ſubordinate view in the account of the formation of woman; and in making that operation take place after Adam's review of the other animals; namely, the very great boon beſtowed, in purpoſely framing for his aid and ſolace ſo ſuitable and lovely a companion as woman. This is, preciſely, the language of the apoſtle Paul, 1 Cor. 8. 9. " For man came not from woman, but woman from man: nor was man created for the woman, " but woman for the man."—It may be worth remarking, that the Hebrew word which I render *faſhioned*, and our vulgar verſion *made*, is neither ברא *creavit*, nor יצר *finxit*, but בנה *ædificavit*. This difference makes Chryſoſtom exclaim, " How great the power of the divine " ARCHITECT! which of ſuch an inſignificant particle of matter (as a rib) conſtructed ſuch " elegantly proportioned limbs, ſuch fine ſenſations; ſo perfect, ſo accompliſhed, ſo complete " an animal." *Ποση τε αριστοτεχνε Θεου ἡ δυναμις, απο του βραχυτατου μερους εκεινου τοσουτων μελων αναλογιαν εργασασθαι, και τοσαυτας αισθησεις δημιουργησαι, και τελειον και ὁλοκληρον και απηρτισμενον ζωον κατασκευασθαι.* " And all this, ſays he, for the comfort and ſolace of man." *Δια γαρ την τουτε παρακλησιν τουτο ζωον εδημιουργηθη.* Chryſ. Hom. xv.

Although the ſtory of Paradiſe, in the ſecond chapter of Geneſis, comes in between the formation of man and the conſtruction of woman, I have joined the two laſt in my Remarks, as being more intimately connected; and have reſerved for the firſt a ſeparate concluding article.

But before we proceed, we muſt again recur to the firſt chapter, in which it is repeatedly ſaid; that every thing which God created was *good*, was *very good*. How, indeed, could it be otherwiſe? Evil of any ſort proceeding, immediately, from an all-wiſe, all-powerful, all-juſt, all-beneficent Being, would be altogether unaccountable. All God's creatures, then, were made to be happy; each claſs in its own ſphere, and according to its proper capacity. Even the reptiles of the waters God *bleſſed:* that is, he bade them be happy. But if the reptiles, birds and beaſts were made for bliſs and happineſs, in their reſpective conditions, how much more ſo that creature which was formed after God's own image and likeneſs, and doomed to have dominion over all the reſt!

All

All this, I preſume, will be readily granted me: and I demand no more for the propriety of placing man in a terreſtrial paradiſe, by the Hebrew coſmologiſt. Where elſe, indeed, could he have placed him? Not ſurely in ſome dreary and unproductive deſert; nor even in a better unbroken ſoil, where it ſhould be neceſſary for the ſovereign of the earth to toil like a ſlave for ſubſiſtence, and *eat his bread in the ſweat of his face!* No; he was to be placed in a ſpot, which without any other cultivation or keeping, than ariſes from pleaſure, ſhould afford him every neceſſary ſenſual gratification. Such a place was the garden of Eden, prepared and planted by the hand of God as a proper receptacle for his favourite Man.—Whether ſuch a garden ever really exiſted, is a queſtion of little moment: an ideal paradiſe equally anſwered the writer's purpoſe; which is evidently to inculcate on the minds of his readers the original happineſs of man. The mythologiſts of all nations have acknowledged a *golden age:* and this was the golden, but ſhort-laſting, age of Hebrew mythology.

Much learning has been employed to aſcertain the ſituation of this *real*, or *ideal* garden: and the moſt fanciful topographic ſyſtems have been hazarded. Yet the Hebrew writer has given us ſuch water-marks and land-marks, as might ſeem to ſettle the controverſy, if, indeed, it be worth the pains of ſettling. The names of the four capital ſtreams, which are ſaid to have iſſued out of Eden, and of the countries which two of them bounded, are expreſsly mentioned. The courſe of the third is deſcribed; and the fourth was too well known to need be more than named; the *Phrath*, or *Euphrates*.—It is little leſs certain that the *Hiddekel*, or rather *Dekel* (for I am perſuaded that the Sam. reading הדקל is the true one), is the *Tigris:* as indeed almoſt all the antient tranſlators render it; Sep. Τίγρις, Syr. דקלת, Chal. דיגלת, Arab. دجلة, Vulg. *Tigris*.—But what rivers are the *Phiſon* and the *Gihon?* Joſephus makes the former the *Ganges*, the latter the *Nile*; and in this he has unaccountably been followed by ſome more recent interpreters.—Others make them change ſides, and call *Phiſon* the Nile, and *Gihon* the Ganges; alike abſurdly: for the ſources of the Nile and Ganges have no connection nor communication with the Tigris and Euphrates *.

The very learned Bochart, who has ſometimes, not ineptly, been called the *Father of conjectures*, and his countryman Huet, whom we commonly call Huetius, out of the *two* laſt-mentioned rivers contrive to make the *four*. They place their Paradiſe on a bend of that great ſtream which is formed by the junction of the Tigris and Euphrates, about Baſſora: and of the two channels, into which that ſtream is again divided before it enter the Perſian gulf, they will have the eaſtern one to be the *Gihon*, and the weſtern the *Phiſon*. But how, in the name of ſenſe, can that ſtream be called a ſource, whence four different *capital ſtreams* flow?—Yet the ſyſtem has been adopted by ſeveral latter commentators; and defended and illuſtrated by our Wells in his Hiſtorical Geography of the Old Teſtament. It is now, I believe, entirely given up; at leaſt on the Continent.

Michaelis, indeed, has riſked an opinion ſomewhat ſimilar. He ſuppoſes that the word נהר here ſignifies not one *ſtream*, but the four rivers after mentioned; at, or a little above, the confluence of which he would place the garden of Eden. Hence thus he renders verſe 10.

* Severianus Gabalenſis makes *Phiſon* the *Danube*.

" Rivers went out of Eden, to water the garden; and theſe ever diverging, one from another, " had four ſprings, or ſources, ראשים *."

The ſtreſs of Michaelis's argument, in favour of this interpretation, lies chiefly on the words נהר and ראש; the former ſignifying not a *ſpring*, but a *river*; the latter not a *river*, but a *ſpring* or *head*. It is true that נהר ſignifies a *river*; but it is alſo true that this appears not to be its radical meaning; which I take to be a *copious efflux* of water, light or any other liquid. A copious ſpring of water, guſhing from a rock, and immediately forming a ſufficient ſtream to water the garden of Eden, might then aptly be called נהר; and that נהר might afterwards be parted into four *heads*, or *capital ſtreams*; ſuch as the Euphrates, Tigris, Phaſis and Araxes certainly are. Ay, but ראש ſignifies a *ſource*; and not a *capital ſtream*, running from that ſource. This, indeed, is the queſtion: but this queſtion muſt not be ſolved by doing violence to the Text, but by extending the meaning of ראש. Now it is not more abuſive to ſay that a ſource or ſtream is divided into four *heads*, than to ſay that we divide a ſubject, or diſcourſe, into four *heads*. The place, where each of theſe rivers parted from its parent ſtream, was as much *it's* head, as if it had ariſen from a different ſource.—Beſides, as Dathe has well obſerved, if the author had meant to ſay that the *river* which went out of Eden ramified backwards to four different ſprings, he would have written, not והיה לארבעה ראשים, but והיו לו ארבעה ראשים. " It had four heads." *Fuerunt illi quatuor capita.*—Finally, how frigid is it to ſay, that four rivers have four ſprings! *Deinde, frigidus eſſe ſenſus videtur, ſi de fluviis narratur, eos habere fontes, ex quibus oriantur.*

Le Clerc places the terreſtrial Paradiſe in Syria, and in the neighbourhood of Damaſcus; chiefly, becauſe in that diſtrict he finds an Eden. But *Eden* is a common name, that denotes any *delightful ſituation*; and is the name of ſeveral places at this day. However, Le Clerc places his Paradiſe in Syria; and his Phiſon is the *Chryſorroas*; his Gihon, the *Orontes*.—But this ſyſtem has likewiſe been generally exploded †.

Some, with Carverus, will have *Phiſon* to be the *Paſitigris* of Pliny; and *Gihon* the *Cydnus* of Juſtin.—But the moſt ſingular of all ſyſtems is that of T. W. Wrighte, A.M. in his *Explanation of the firſt two chapters of Geneſis*, printed in 1788. According to him, Phiſon is the brook *Arnon*; Gihon the *Jabbok*, Hiddekel the *Jarmoch*—and what, think ye, is Euphrates?—The upper *Jordan!* " This (ſays he) was the river which went out of Eden, to water the " garden; the main channel of which was formed by the conflux of four ſtreams (and is there- " fore not unfrequently called in Scripture, κατ' εξοχην, ὁ ποταμος, or ὁ ποταμος ὁ μεγας.) The " name of the firſt, *Arnon*; the name of the ſecond, *Jabbok*; the third *Jarmoch*; and the fourth, " the ſtream of the leſſer *Jordan* itſelf; *ipſe Perath*, or the river Euphrates." This is commenting with freedom. But to proceed—

Reland and Calmet will have the Phiſon to be the *Phaſis*, and the Gihon the *Araxes:* and this opinion, which they have both defended with much ingenuity, is at preſent the prevailing

* Es quollen auch flüſſe aus Eden hervor, den garten zu waſſeren; und ſie gingen immer weiter von einander, und hatten vier uhrſprünge oder quellen.—The Greek Verſion of Venice ſeems to lean the ſame way. χαχειθεν διαιροιτο, τελει τ' εις τεσσερας αρχας.

† The word *caput* has the ſame latitude, and is uſed by Cæſar in the ſame ſenſe, De Bell. Gall. 4. 10. where, ſpeaking of the Rhine, he ſays, " multis *capitibus* in occanum influit." I owe this remark to Archbiſhop Secker.

one.

one. I muſt ſay, however, that it is attended with many difficulties, which, perhaps, will never be entirely removed. The truth is, that, with all our improvements in geography, we know very little about the real ſprings and courſes of any one of thoſe rivers: and nothing leſs than an actual ſurvey, and tracing them, through all their meanders and ramifications, can lead us to any certain concluſion on the ſubject *.

It is, indeed, a queſtion of no importance; and I almoſt regret to have beſtowed on it ſo much time and ink. Yet, ſince my hand is in, I muſt, as a Philologiſt, ſay ſomething about the etymon of the rivers and other proper names here mentioned.

Phiſon פישון, if it be not a foreign word, may be derived from פּשׁה, which denotes *exuberation*; a term perfectly ſuitable to a large, deep, expatiating river; ſuch as the Phaſis certainly is: which rolls along its waters with great majeſty, and is continually increaſing by influent ſtreams.

Gihon, גיחון from גוח, נחח or נחה; which denotes *impetuoſity*, *eruption*, *burſting forth*; ſignifies the *impetuous*, *eruptive* river: an epithet peculiarly adapted to the *Araxes*, which breaks down every bridge † and barrier in its rapid courſe.

It is not, indeed, the Araxes, but the Oxus, which now bears the Arabic name *Gihon:* but this is no formidable objection; as *Gihon* ſeems to have been a common appellation for any exuberating rapid ſtream. The Nile and the Ganges are ſometimes ſo called.—The great difficulty in the hypotheſis of Reland lies in this: that the ſources of his four rivers are at too great a diſtance, one from another, to be ſaid to iſſue from the ſame ſpot. It has been anſwered; that the univerſal deluge may have changed their ſources and channels. Granted; but the author of Geneſis wrote long after the univerſal deluge, and muſt have had in view the ſituation and ſprings of rivers then exiſting.—If the real ſources of the Tigris and Euphrates could be fully aſcertained; and if theſe two were found nearly to meet; the ſources of the two other rivers might poſſibly be detected, nigh to that place: but theſe, I think, cannot be the Phaſis and Araxes; unleſs their courſes were very different in the time of our Hebrew writer, from what they now are.

After all, it may well be, that we are labouring to find out a ſpot that never exiſted but in the creative imagination of the mythologiſt. It was neceſſary for him to place his Paradiſe ſomewhere: and the fertility and richneſs of thoſe countries through which ran the Tigris and Euphrates, would naturally lead him to place it about their ſources: which, with two other capital rivers, he makes to flow from one common ſpring, which watered his garden of Eden. In this imaginary hypotheſis, I ſee no difficulty in admitting the Phaſis and Araxes to be the *Phiſon* and the *Gihon* of Geneſis.—If the learned Joſephus, and the Jews of his day, were ſo ignorant of geography, as to make the Nile and the Ganges two of the rivers that flowed from Eden; how eaſy was it for the Hebrew mythologiſt to bring rivers together, that never met, to embelliſh his ſtory: rivers celebrated over all the Eaſt for the fertility of ſoil, and the rich productions, of their coaſts!

This naturally brings us to the countries which the Phiſon and Gihon are ſaid to have bounded; and which, in ſome reſpect, ſhould guide us to the courſe of the rivers themſelves.

The Phiſon, ſays the Hebrew writer, "boundeth the whole land of Havila, where gold is

* See *Michaëlis*'s Supplementa ad Lex. Hebr.

† Pontem indignatus Araxes. VIRGIL.

"found;

"found; and excellent is the gold of that land."—The word *Havila*, החוילה with the article, comes from חול *ſand, duſt*, any *ſmall particle* of matter; which ſignification it retains in Chald. Syr. Sam. חולית, חלא, חולה. The appellative-proper החוילה, then, denotes the *land of duſt*; i. e. *duſt by excellence*, or *gold-duſt*; as we call a part of Africa the *Gold-duſt coaſt*; and ſometimes ſimply the *Duſt-coaſt*.—The name is perfectly applicable to the country bounded by the Phaſis: every ſchool-boy has heard and read of *Colchis* and the *Golden-fleece:* and it is well known that gold-duſt, or that which is found in ſmall unmixt particles in the beds of rivers, is the pureſt and beſt gold. *Nec abſolutius aurum eſt* (ſays Pliny) *curſu ipſo trituque perpolitum.*—Indeed I think it highly probable, that all the rivers and rivulets which run into the Euxine, are, or were formerly, productive of gold, from the Phaſis to the Halys. It was, probably, from thoſe rivers, that Crœſus, king of Lydia, drew his immenſe riches.

Not only *gold* was found in the land of Havila, but alſo "*pearls* and *onyxes:*" for ſo I have rendered the words הבדלח ואבן השהם.—But, although I have ſo rendered, I am not ſure that ſuch is preciſely the meaning; and therefore it is but fair to ſtate the caſe as it is.—The word בדלח, or, as 5 MSS. have it, ברולח, occurs but twice in the Hebrew Scriptures: here, and in Numb. 11. 7. We there learn that, in colour, it reſembled the *manna:* whence, and from a ſimilarity of ſounds, it has generally been thought to be the Greek βδελλιον and the Latin *bdellium*; a reſinous gum, which we have from Arabia and the Indies; and which, in colour, has certainly ſome reſemblance to the manna of our ſhops. But whether the manna of our ſhops and the manna of the Iſraelites be the ſame, is yet an undecided queſtion: nor is the mere ſimilarity of ſound a ſure etymological criterion; unleſs ſtrengthened by other circumſtantial evidence.

The antient interpreters render the word variouſly. Sep. ανθραξ here, but in Num. χρυσταλλον. The other Greek tranſlators have in both places βδελλιον.—Onkelos and the Thargums retain the Hebrew word בדלחא or בידלחא. Syr. in the printed text has, in both places, ברולחא with a *reſh* inſtead of *daleth:* but Michaëlis deems this a typographical error: and ſuch it may be; for *reſh* and *daleth* have often been confounded and interchanged in the Syriac as well as in the Hebrew; and the Syriac verſion has been very incorrectly edited in all the Polyglotts.—Yet it is poſſible that the Syr. tranſlator might read ברלח in his Hebrew copy: whether that were the original reading, or a blunder of the copyiſt. From ברולחא the Portugueſe *perola*, and the Italian and Spaniſh *perla* (whence the French and our *perle* and *pearl*), might readily be derived.—Be this as it may, both Arabs underſtood the word to ſignify a *pearl:* for they render it by לולו or לולוה, which decidedly has that meaning—and, what is remarkable, the Greek of Venice has alſo μαργαριτης.

In the Sam. verſion the word is rendered פנקלה in Gen. and פקלה in Num.: but what either of theſe ſignifies, is altogether uncertain.—The Perſic has, in both places, בלור which the Latin tranſlator renders, in Gen. *bdellium*; in Num. *cryſtallum.* So much for the antient verſions.

In the preſent Maſoretic text there has been found no diverſity of reading: but 2 Sam. MSS. in Gen., and 1 in Num. have בדלה with an *hé:* but this is moſt probably an overſight of the ſcribe. If it were the true reading, it would favour Huet's derivation from בדל; and we ſhould then get rid of one of thoſe *quadriliterals*, which ſo much puzzle etymologiſts.—I am willing, however, to believe that the original term is בדלח or בדולח; and that it is an exotic word; to be

be found perhaps in ſome Perſic or Armenian dialect: although I cannot find it in any lexicon.

If the antient tranſlators were ſo much divided about the meaning of בדלח, we need not be ſurpriſed, that the moderns are not agreed.—The greater part, from Pagninus downward, are for *bdellium:* ſome few for *cryſtal:* Deodati alone, I think, for the *pearl*;—and that only in his French verſion; for in his Italian he has *bdellio*.

The *pearl* was adopted by Bochart, and ſtrenuouſly defended in his Hierozon. vol. ii. b. 5. ch. 5. to which I refer the curious reader who delights in accumulated erudition and ingenious conjecture. One thing detracts from the force of Bochart's arguments; namely, his grounding them chiefly on the ſuppoſition that Havila lay on the Perſian gulf, celebrated for its pearl-fiſhery.—The ſame ſyſtem, for the ſame reaſon, was adopted by Huet: but this ſyſtem being now univerſally ſcouted, the meaning of בדולח muſt be made out to be a *pearl* by other arguments. Now the ſtrongeſt argument in favour of the *pearl*, that I have found, is a paſſage of Benjamin Tudelenſis; which, as the book is rather rare, I ſhall give in his own words. On his arrival at *Katiph*, or *Elkatiph* (a maritime town on the Perſian gulf about ſix days journey from Baſſora), he ſays, שם ימצא הבדולח· ובארבע ועשרי בניסן ירד שם מטר על פני המים ומקבלי המטר הדוא ונסגרים ונופלין לתוך קרקע הים· ובחצי תשרי באין שם שני בני אדם לקרקע הים בחבלים ומלקטים את השרצי הדם· ומוציאין אותם׳ ומבקעי אותם׳ ומוציאי מתוכם אבנים הללו.

The ſubſtance of which is, that in the month of March the drops of rain-water which fall on the ſurface of the ſea, are ſwallowed by the mothers of pearl and carried into the bottom of the ſea; and that theſe animals being fiſhed for and opened, about the middle of September, are found to contain pearls. It is remarkable that the author uſes both the Hebrew name *bedolah* and the Arabic *lulu*, the one at the beginning of his narration, the other at the end of it.

Here, then, is one clear teſtimony, ſuch as it is, in favour of the pearl. It is no objection that the ſtory of the formation of pearls is fabulous: it was generally believed by the antient naturaliſts that the mothers of pearl were impregnated by celeſtial dew in the ſpring of the year. On this fabulous impregnation, a ſtaunch etymologiſt might make בדלח a compound of בן and דלח, which in Arabic ſignifies a *cloud teeming with rain:* hence, he might ſay, the pearl is fitly called *the ſon of the cloud.* See Caſtel on the root דלח.

He might next tell you, how *bedolah* came to be changed into *berolah*; namely, by a change of the Hebrew בן into the Chaldee and Syriac בר which equally ſignifies *a ſon:* and, then, the derivation of *perola*, *perla*, and *pearl*, is ſelf-evident: for nothing is more common than the intermutation of *b* and *p*.

Another argument in favour of *pearl*, or at leaſt ſome gem or other, is its being claſſed with אבן השהם which, whether it be the *onyx* or not, is certainly a precious ſtone of ſome kind.—But what I have to ſay on this gem will be found in another place; when I ſhall have occaſion to remark on the ſtones that compoſed the breaſt-plate of Aaron.—Mean time we ſhall ſuppoſe it to be the *onyx*, and its companion to be the *pearl*. But is the *pearl* found in the country bounded by the *Phaſis?* or in the Euxine ſea into which the *Phaſis* runs? That indeed I know not, and wait for information; which moſt probably I ſhall never obtain.

The

The ſecond river, *Gihon*, is ſaid in Geneſis to have "bounded the whole land of *Chuſh*." But where is this *Chuſh* now to be found? Various countries, and at a great diſtance, one from another, are in Hebrew called *Chuſh* כוש. It more generally denotes *Ethiopia*; but the Ethiopians ſeem to have been only a colony of the original *Chuſhites* who reſided in Arabia-Felix. But neither the *Chuſhites* of Ethiopia nor the *Chuſhites* of Arabia can be the *Chuſhites* whoſe country the *Gihon* bounded: we muſt therefore look for them elſewhere; and if *Gihon* be the *Araxes*, we muſt place the land of *Chuſh* on that river. Accordingly, Leland finds it in the country of the *Coſſæans*, or, as Plutarch calls them, the *Cuſſæans*, Κουσσαιοι: which, Strabo ſays, was divided from Media by the Araxes. The etymon is, doubtleſs, ſufficiently ſtriking: yet Michaëlis is inclined to think that *Chuſh* is the כאתּ * of Abulfeda, formerly the capital of *Chovaraxm*, "on "the eaſt ſide of the Gihon," ſays that Arabic geographer. And Moſes Cheronenſis, in his hiſtory of the Armenians, ſays that *Balcha* (בלח the preſent capital of that province) is a city of the *Cuſæans*. All this would ſeem to make for the opinion of thoſe, who take the Gihon of Geneſis for the Oxus.—Michaëlis even imagines, that the *Suſitani* of Q. Curtius, whom Alexander found nigh to that river, may have been corrupted from *Chuſitani*.—But enough of topographical conjecture—Let us return to Paradiſe.

The part of the paradiſaical hiſtory, which has moſt puzzled interpreters, whether allegoriſts or literaliſts, is what is ſaid of the *tree of life*, and of the *tree of the knowledge of good and evil*. Theſe two trees are ſaid to have been planted in the middle of Paradiſe בתוך הגן. I know that the word בתוך may ſignify ſimply *in*; but the context here ſeems to determine its meaning; they were trees planted in the very centre of the garden †; ſuppoſed to be the occaſional reſidence of God himſelf; as we ſhall ſee preſently.

But what was the *tree of life*?—According to the Hebrew idiom, any tree, or plant, bearing an wholeſome or medicinal fruit, might properly enough be denominated a *tree of life*; as freſh, ſalubrious, running waters are termed *waters of life*. But the compoſer of this *mythos* muſt have had ſomething more in view. His *tree of life* ſeems to have borne fruit of an extraordinary kind, by which the life of man might be prolonged, and his decaying health from time to time reſtored ‡—I would not ſay for ever; for that were abſurd; nor is it ſo much as hinted at by the author: but at leaſt for a much longer time than has ſince been allotted to man. The delightful garden of Eden would have wanted ſomething, if there had been wanting in it ſuch a ſalutiferous plant: nor was the fruit of this plant interdicted from man, until after he had eaten the fruit of the *tree of knowledge:* to which we muſt next turn our attention.

It is called *the tree of the knowledge of* GOOD and EVIL; that is, in Hebrew phraſeology, *every thing knowable*. But why is the fruit of this tree forbidden to man? or, to ſpeak more properly, Why does our author feign ſuch a prohibition?—The queſtion, I think, is not hard to be anſwered.

* I need not tell the Oriental ſcholar, that it is uſual with the Arabs to change the Hebr. *ſhin* into *tsé*.

† Bene D. J. Pott. "Licet בתוך, *in medio*, pro ſimplici ב, *in*, poni ſolere, ne tironem quidem fugiat; hoc nexu "tamen commode etiam, ad verbum, *in medio horti* reddi poſſe putaverim, ut arbores primariæ primarium quoque locum "teneant." Comment. De ant. Documento, p. 38.

‡ For, however perfect he might come from the hands of his Creator, he was liable by his mere mechanical ſtructure to be worn out at laſt.

It

It is well known to politicians, that the great bulk of mankind will rarely be kept in ſtrict ſubordination, unleſs they be kept in a certain degree of ignorance. Neither the myſteries of ſtate nor the myſteries of religion are to be too narrowly pried into. *Scrutator majeſtatis opprimetur a gloria*, Prov. 25. 27. I am aware that theſe words are only in the Latin Vulgate, and correſpond not entirely with the original: but the maxim has been often inculcated, and is perfectly conſonant with the general idea that myſteries are not to be ſearched into. Implicit faith and implicit obedience have always been conſidered, by legiſlators, as the beſt preſervatives from innovations and revolutions, in church or ſtate: and a prelate of our own nation and days was *politically* in the right, when he affirmed, that the *people* have nought to do with the *laws*, but *obey* them. Whether this be a good or bad, a ſalutary or pernicious maxim; or whether a general diffuſion of knowledge produce more evil than good; I am not now examining. A celebrated author of our own time * has treated the ſubject with much ingenuity, and decided againſt the ſpread of ſcience. But that is not here the queſtion. The fact is, that all the antient legiſlators required a greater or leſs degree of implicit obedience to their reſpective laws; and for that purpoſe feigned an intercourſe with ſome Divinity to make that obedience more palatable to the credulous multitude.

But was this, it will be ſaid, the caſe with Moſes?—Why not? And where is the proof that Moſes did not, in this, act like other legiſlators? This conceſſion, ſo far from diminiſhing the character of Moſes and the wiſdom of his laws, greatly enhances both; and is perfectly compatible with the only *divine inſpiration*, which ſenſe and reaſon can admit—at leaſt, which my ſenſe and reaſon can admit †.

Indeed, I cannot conceive how Moſes could have governed ſo rude, ſo ſtubborn, ſo turbulent a nation; and made them ſubmit to ſuch a code of laws as he deviſed for them; without feigning an immediate intercourſe with the Deity, and aſcribing to Him every injunction laid upon them. If, in ſpite of this precaution, and in defiance of God, they were conſtantly murmuring, and rebelling; what muſt it have been, if Moſes had only ſpoken as from himſelf?

But although his communications with God were frequent, and almoſt on every emergency, he was particularly careful to keep the people at a diſtance from the intercourſe. No one muſt approach the mount, while he is receiving the Decalogue, under pain of death. No one muſt hear the reſponſes given from the oracle, but through him; no one but he ſees God "face to "face."—No one muſt reaſon againſt any of his ordinances; no one object to any of his deciſions: becauſe his ordinances and deciſions are all from the mouth of God. In a word, the people muſt have no more religious or political knowledge than he is pleaſed to parcel out to them, by himſelf or his brother Aaron, whom he makes his prophet and prieſt: the reſt have nothing to do with the *law*, but *to obey it*.

All this is ſo clear from the whole hiſtory of his legiſlation, that every reader of any diſcernment muſt have been ſtruck with it: but how is all this applicable to the *mythos* I am now explaining? It is perfectly applicable.—If God, on the very creation of man, forbade him to taſte of the tree of knowledge, and if diſobedience to that precept brought about all the evil

* Rouſſeau.

† For, "every good gift, and every perfect boon, cometh down from above, from the father of lights." Jam. 1. 17.

which we now find in the world: how dangerous is it to ſeek to know more than what God is pleaſed to communicate; how impious to ſearch into myſteries above our humble ſphere!—In Paradiſe mankind were ignorant, but they were ſimple and innocent: ſo innocent and ſimple, that "although they were both naked they were not aſhamed:" but no ſooner have they taſted of the tree of knowledge, than they are "aſhamed, and hide themſelves."—Who does not perceive the beauty of ſo well contrived a ſtory?

We are now come to the laſt *act* of this mythological *drama*; man's tranſgreſſion, and his conſequent expulſion from Paradiſe: which, let us ſee, if it be not as well conceived, and as aptly conſtructed as the reſt.

In however happy a ſtate man may have been at firſt created; howſoever delightful the firſt place of his abode; his preſent reſidence is not a paradiſe, nor his ſtate a ſtate of abſolute felicity. "Man, born of woman, is ſhort-lived, and full of trouble: for all his days are ſorrows, and his labour grief: he cometh forth like a flower, and is cut down! as a ſhadow he fleeth, and continueth not*." He is no more placed in a garden of pleaſure, that yieldeth its delicious productions without irkſome labour; he muſt toil and ſweat to procure his daily bread; he is expoſed to numberleſs dangers, liable to various diſeaſes and accidents, has no *tree of life* to repair his broken conſtitution, and dies at laſt, for the moſt part, in agony and pain. Theſe evils are common to man and woman; but the latter has peculiar ills to lament. The nauſeas of breeding, the pains of child-bed, ſubordination to a huſband and domeſtic ſlavery are her particular lot.

Now, whence all this maſs of miſery? Our hiſtorian informs us, it aroſe from the firſt pair of mankind having violated a divine precept, from an ambitious deſire of knowing as much as the Gods!—Are the Gods then jealous of their privileges?—They have been ſo repreſented by the mythologiſts of every nation.—For the ſtealth of a ſingle ſpark of celeſtial fire, the box of Pandora, replete with manifold evils, was emptied upon the whole earth! The God of the Jews, JEHOVAH, is expreſsly denominated a jealous God; "JEALOUS is his name." Exod. 34. 14. "With *jealouſy* he is clad, as with a cloak." Iſ. 59. 17. He will have his people to worſhip no other Divinity but himſelf; he "viſits the ſins of the fathers," in this reſpect, "upon their children, unto the third and fourth generation." Exod. 20. 5. Is it ſurpriſing, then, that he ſhould be repreſented by the Hebrew mythologiſt, as jealous of man's becoming participant of divine knowledge; and that the origin of evil ſhould be aſcribed by him to that audacious and forbidden attempt?

But what tempted the firſt man and woman to violate the precept of God, and taſte, in defiance of that precept, the fruit of the tree of *interdicted knowledge?* Our author ſays, it was a cunning ſerpent: our theologians tell us, it was the more artful Devil! Which are we to believe?—"Which are we to believe!" exclaims the man of orthodoxy; "why, to be ſure, the theologians; the *infallible* church of Chriſt."—But, then, what becomes of the *infallible* word of God? Let any one, ſetting aſide for a moment his theological prepoſſeſſions, read over, and over, the third chapter of Geneſis, and ſay, if he find in the whole narrative a ſingle veſtige, a ſingle hint, of any thing like the Devil, or his agency in this tranſaction?

* Job 14. 1, 2. and Eccleſ. 2. 23.

Indeed,

Indeed, if the Devil had any thing to do there, the narrator is an unfair, disingenuous hiſtorian; whether he be ſuppoſed to give a real hiſtory, or a poetical figment in the garb of hiſtory. Nothing can be imagined more abſurd than the preſent ſtory, if the Devil were the real agent in the deception of Heva; but make the agent a real ſerpent, and every thing is congruous and rational. The hiſtory of the fall was either handed down by tradition from the firſt pair themſelves, or revealed to the writer, or invented by him. In any one of theſe ſuppoſitions the interference of the Devil is unaccountable.

For, in the firſt place, if Adam told the ſtory, as it now is, to Seth; and at the ſame time knew, that not a ſerpent, but the Devil in the form of a ſerpent, or through the organ of a ſerpent, was the real ſeducer; he reported the ſtory in a very unfaithful manner; by concealing the moſt important part of it.

Secondly, if the ſtory came not from Adam, but was divinely revealed to the writer of Geneſis, the matter becomes worſe; for Adam might not know that the Devil had any thing to do in the buſineſs: and in truth he could have no ſuch knowledge, if he heard and ſaw no more than is reported in the narrative before us: whereas God muſt have known every circumſtance connected with the tranſaction: yet in the revelation which he is here ſuppoſed to make, he is totally ſilent of the Devil; and blames and condemns the ſerpent only, as the ſeducer of mankind. This then is a partial, ambiguous and fallacious revelation, if the Devil were the real ſeducer.

Laſtly, if the ſtory came neither from Adam nor from God, but be, as I think it is, a mythological moral figment; it is a bungling tale indeed, if the Devil have any concern in it. It would have been as eaſy for Moſes, as for Milton, to make the Devil enter into the plan of his drama; and he would, no doubt, have made him act a conſpicuous part in it, if he had conceived him to be the principal agent.—He has made him act no part at all! he has given him no ſhare in the ſeduction! he has not ſo much as hinted at his exiſtence! and yet we are confidently told that HE was the grand maſter-wheel of the whole movement!—If ever aſſertion deſerved the name of paradox, this ſuperlatively merits it.

I have ſaid that the writer of Geneſis does not ſo much as hint, that ſuch a perſonage as the Devil exiſted: and I am fully perſuaded that the writer of Geneſis had no idea of ſuch a being as the Devil; who ſeems to have been totally unknown to the whole Hebrew nation, until the Babyloniſh captivity. This has, in my apprehenſion, been ſo clearly ſhewn by Eichhorn, that I have little or nothing to add to what he has ſaid; and beg leave to refer my curious readers to his *Eſſay on Primeval Hiſtory*, already quoted: eſpecially as I ſhall have occaſion to treat more copiouſly on the ſubject in another place.—I haſten to the completion of the mythos.

Ver. 25. *Although Adam and his wife were both naked, yet they were not aſhamed.* Simple, innocent pair! ye had not yet aſpired at that ſuperior knowledge of *good and of evil*, which had been interdicted you! ye had not yet wiſhed to become like the Gods! Soon ſhall ye have cauſe to repent of your attempt to rival divinity! For,

CHAP. III.

Ver. 1. *THE ſerpent, who was the moſt crafty* (or *knowing*) *of all the animals of the field, ſaid to the woman*, &c.—Was the ſerpent, then, a ſpeaking animal, at that period? He was: ſay the more antient interpreters, both Jews and Chriſtians: or, at leaſt, he was inſpired by the Devil to ſpeak on that occaſion; as, on another occaſion, Balaam's aſs was inſpired by God!—No, ſays Abarbanel, and moſt modern commentators; it was all dumb ſhow, a real pantomime. The ſerpent, in the ſight of the woman, ate of the forbidden fruit, and received no hurt from it: the fruit was otherwiſe delectable, and knowledge was deſirable: ſo ſhe concluded, that ſhe too might eat, and be ſafe.

This latter mode of interpretation is, certainly, not incompatible with the oriental ſtyle; and in very many caſes we muſt admit it, or admit abſurdities. The dialogue between the ſerpent and Heva, and even between God and Adam, &c. may readily be conceived to have happened in this manner.—The only queſtion is, if, all things conſidered, the author of this narration is to be underſtood, as ſpeaking here literally, or tropologically: that is, whether he conſiders his *ſerpent* endowed with the gift of language, and uttering articulate ſounds, or only expreſſing by geſture and action what the mythologiſt clothes in words? Now, I confeſs, that I am much inclined to think, that the *ſerpent*, in the view of the writer, is a ſpeaking ſerpent; and a ſerpent of a different form from the preſent ſerpent.—It muſt have been a general opinion among the Jews, as late as the days of Joſephus, that not only the ſerpent, but all the other animals, had originally the faculty of ſpeech: ὁμοφωνουντων δε κατ' εκεινου καιρου των ζωων απαντων, ὁ οφις, συνδιαιτωμενος τῳ τε Αδαμῳ και τῃ γυναικι. κ. τ. λ. Ant. l. 1. c. 4. I ſee no reaſon then, why the author of Geneſis might not avail himſelf of that tradition, howſoever fabulous, in his mythological narration of the fall of man.—Be this as it may, the ſtory proceeds thus: "Is it true then, ſaid the ſerpent, that ye may not eat the fruit of every tree in the garden?—Nay, replied the woman—we may eat of the fruit of every tree but one—but of this one tree we muſt not taſte; we muſt not touch it, on pain of certain death. No; ſaid the crafty ſerpent, ye ſhall not die—God is only jealous of you—he well knows that whenſoever ye ſhall eat of the fruit of that tree, "your eyes will be opened; and that like God himſelf (or "like gods") ye will have the knowledge of good and evil."—Whether this argument be urged in words or actions, it is all the ſame to the mythos. The argument had its full effect upon the woman: ſhe ate, and made her huſband eat alſo: "their eyes were opened," that is, their knowledge was increaſed *; but they were conſcious that this acquiſition was in direct diſobedience to a divine precept; they ſaw they were naked; and hid themſelves among the trees of the garden from the preſence of the Lord!—All this is told in ſo ſimple, ſo ſhort, and ſo ſeemingly artleſs a manner; that one cannot help admiring the genius, and judgment, and even the taſte that pervade every part of the narrative.

Behold, now, the great cataſtrophe! In the breeze of the evening, the voice of God is heard in the garden—calling to Adam: "Where art thou?"—"I heard thy voice," replies affrighted man; "and, being naked, I hid myſelf."—"And who," ſays God, "hath told thee that

* So Secker, in his MS. notes.

"thou

" thou art naked? How cameſt thou to know ſo much as that? Haſt thou eaten of that " tree, of which I commanded thee not to eat?"—" I have eaten of it," ſays Adam: " but that " ſame woman, whom thou haſt given me, for a companion, gave it me."—" How cameſt " thou to do this?" ſays God to the woman.—" The ſerpent ſeduced me, and I ate!"

Had God, next, queſtioned the ſerpent, as in juſtice he ought to have done, if the ſerpent was a mere tool in the hand of Satan, the ſerpent muſt have been made to reply: " The Devil " ſpoke by my mouth."—But no; the climax reſts here; and the doom is pronounced accordingly, beginning by the ſerpent, not by the Devil: of whom there is not a ſingle ſentence, nor a ſingle inſinuation.

The ſerpent, then, and not the Devil, was, in the view of our mythologiſt, the real ſeducer of Heva. But what induced the writer to make this choice? Apparently three obvious motives. 1ſt, The known *craftineſs* and *wiſdom* of the ſerpentine race. 2dly, The horror with which the ſight of them inſpires all other animals. 3dly, The particular enmity and hoſtility that exiſts between them and man. Could he have, in the whole creation, pitched upon an animal ſo proper for his purpoſe?—The craft and cunning of this ſingular animal is employed to raiſe in the mind of weak woman an irregular appetite for an apparently delicious fruit, that is to increaſe her knowledge. She falls an eaſy victim to her ſenſuality and curioſity, and prevails on her huſband to ſhare in her crime. They acquire new knowledge, at the expence of their innocence and obedience; are expelled from the garden of delight, condemned to lead a life of labour and affliction, and to die before their day:—and all this becauſe they would aim at a knowledge above their ſphere, and taſte of a fruit that grew only for the *Gods!* I ſay *Gods*, becauſe I think it clear from ver. 22. that the writer makes Jehovah to addreſs himſelf to other *Gods*, inferior Gods, if you will, but ſtill to Gods of ſome ſort; that is, to celeſtial ſuperiour beings whoſe occaſional reſidence was Paradiſe; and where the fruit of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil was for them reſerved. It was the ambroſia of Eden. See the remark on that verſe.

Come we now to the reſpective ſentences pronounced againſt our delinquents. To the ſerpent God ſaid: ver. 14. " Becauſe thou haſt done this, thou ſhalt be more execrable than any " of all the cattle and animals of the field." Which, in my note, I have explained thus: " No animal whatever ſhall be ſo odious to mankind, as thou." I am not however ſure, that the other rendering " thou ſhalt be execrable to, or abhorred by, all the cattle," &c. is not a preferable reading. It depends upon the meaning of the prepoſition מ, whether it ſhould here be rendered *præ* or *ab*; *above* or *by*.

Ib. *On thy belly thou ſhalt go, and duſt thou ſhalt eat, all the days of thy life.* St. Baſil is of opinion that, before this ſentence, the ſerpent was upright: and this appears, to me, to be the caſe; I mean in the mythos. For I cannot ſee with what propriety, *creeping on the belly, and eating the duſt*, could be a part of the puniſhment, if it were not a degradation from a prior ſtate. Thoſe who make it no part of the puniſhment, ſeem not to be aware, that it is a uſeleſs pleonaſm.

Ver. 15. *A mutual enmity I will put*, &c. Whether this mutual enmity exiſted before, is a matter of no conſequence. It was enough for the writer's purpoſe, to obſerve that it now exiſts.

Ver. 15. —*between thy ſeed, and her ſeed: they ſhall ſeek to bruiſe thee on the head, and thou to bite them in the heel.* So I render the Hebrew; contrary, in one reſpect, I believe, to almoſt all modern tranſlators. The difference is in determining the meaning of the words זרע and הוא; that is, whether the word *ſeed* is to be underſtood plurally of the whole poſterity of Heva, or only of one individual of her poſterity, namely, JESUS CHRIST? The great bulk of interpreters render הוא in the ſingular; by either *he* or *it*; and our common verſion by both: "*It* "ſhall bruiſe thy head, and thou ſhalt bruiſe *his* heel:" and we are referred, in the concordantial margin, to not leſs than 18 or 19 paſſages of the Old and New Teſtament, for an explanation. Yet it happens, that not one of thoſe paſſages, ſo oſtentatiouſly quoted, throws a ſingle ray of light on the ſubject; nor, in truth, has any concern with it *.

Now I maintain, that neither of the words in queſtion can be properly rendered in the ſingular number (in any language that has not a neuter gender) without doing violence to the text, and making it abſolutely inconſiſtent with itſelf. For, in the firſt place, זרע, σπερμα, *ſemen, ſeed*, are certainly equivalent to *poſterity*; and ought generally to be underſtood and rendered plurally, where there is no particular circumſtance to limit the meaning. The *ſeed* of Heva, then, and her *poſterity*, are equivalent terms: and as there is no particular circumſtance to limit the word to any one individual of her poſterity, it muſt include her whole poſterity.

In the next place, if it did not include her whole poſterity, the text would be unintelligible, and the paralleliſm abſurd.—If Jeſus Chriſt were the *one*, and only *one*, of her ſeed, here alluded to, the whole ſentence would be a riddle indeed; a riddle which neither Oedipus, nor Samſon, nor Solomon could have ſolved. For, whoſe head is he ſaid to bruiſe, or lay in wait for? The head of the ſerpent? or of the ſerpent's ſeed? Of both, according to the Text; but of neither, according to our Divines, unleſs the Devil be the ſeed of the ſerpent †; as JESUS is the ſeed of the woman. Truly, truly, this is a ſtrange interpretation of a text as clear as can be; and which, but for theological prepoſſeſſions, would not puzzle the meaneſt capacity. —Reader! whoſoever thou be, who underſtandeſt the firſt elements of the Hebrew dialect, and the firſt elements of logic, lay aſide for a moment thy ſcholaſtic prejudices and thy college-dictates, and read over with attention the third chapter of Geneſis; and ſay if thou findeſt in it any veſtige of a ſeducing *Devil*, or a redeeming *Saviour* ‡?—Thou mayeſt then turn to Calmet's Commentary, or any other commentary of the ſame bran; and keep thyſelf from *laughing*, if thou canſt.—But who would not weep, on ſeeing ſuch critics as Roſenmüller adopting ſo abſurd an hypotheſis, and thus paraphraſing ver. 15. "Inimicitias excitabo inter "te et mulierem, inter tuum genus et *unum* ex mulieris poſteritate: hic te proculcabit, licet "a te victo mordebitur! Hic enim (adds he) ſenſus hujus verſus eſſe videtur. In tabula hie-

* It grieves one to ſee, how ridiculouſly our concordantial references have been formed. One would think that the great point in view were, who ſhould accumulate moſt paſſages; without regard to their relationſhip: yet this is called, *Scripture explaining Scripture*.

† I cannot here withhold an excellent obſervation of Secker, "If *thy* ſeed, ſays he, be one ſeed, ſo muſt *his* ſeed: and how is either the Devil, or all the demons, the ſeed of the ſerpent?" MS. Notes.

‡ Bene Dathe: "Non faveo illis, qui promiſſiones de Meſſia e Vet. Teſt. detrudere ſtudent: ſed intrudere eas in "loca, in quibus non leguntur, æque ac illud temerarium mihi videtur."

"roglyphica

" roglyphica hæc picta eſſe videntur: Serpens major, cum minoribus, ſymbola Satanæ et reli-
" quorum dæmonum. Vir quidam, Adamo ſimilis, unus ex Evæ poſteris, pedibus conterit
" caput ſerpentis, a quo in calce mordetur; ſymbolica imago Chriſti morte ſua victoriam de
" Diabolo reportantis. Ex hac igitur hypotheſi, hic verſus promiſſionem de Meſſia, ſive *prot-*
" *evangelium*, continet."—It is rather ſurpriſing that this *protevangelium* or *firſt-goſpel* ſhould not have been noticed by future *Evangeliſts*; and never appealed to either by Chriſt himſelf, or by his Apoſtles.—But here I muſt again refer my reader to Eichhorn, who has handled this matter with great ability, and with an irreſiſtible ſtrength of argument. See alſo Zaccharіæ Biblioth. Theol. part ii. ſect. 124. and Dathe on Geneſis.

Before I leave the *ſerpent*, I have two or three philological remarks to make.

1. The word נחש, a *ſerpent*, is in the printed Sam. Text כחש, which ſignifies a *liar*: " and " the woman ſaid to the *liar*, &c." This is called by Michaëlis and Roſenmüller a various reading worthy of notice, *notatu digna lectionis varietas*. It is ſo little worthy of notice, that it is evidently a typographical blunder, rectified by ſix Sam. MSS.* the Hebrew Text, and all the antient verſions. The errour was eaſily committed. The *caph* and *nun*, in the Sam. characters, reſemble one another ſo much, as to be eaſily interchanged. It is matter of wonder, however, that this faulty reading of the Sam. Text did not, in ſome meaſure, reconcile it to its greateſt adverſaries; who at the ſame time were friendly to the *diabolic* ſyſtem. " The " *Devil* was a *liar* from the beginning," would have, in that ſuppoſition, been perfectly applicable; and holden forth with triumph againſt the *Serpentarians*.

2. The relative הוא correſponding with the antecedent זרע, *ſeed*; and which I have rendered *they*; that is, the woman's *poſterity*, has been the ſubject of a very ſerious controverſy, in latter times, between the Roman Catholic and Proteſtant interpreters. The Vulgate having *ipſa*, the Roman Catholics applied it to the Virgin Mary, protypified in Heva. This was by the Proteſtant party deemed little leſs than blaſphemy, and reprobated in the moſt bitter terms. The Catholics, on the other hand, inſiſted that the Hebrew Text was corrupted; and that inſtead of הוא we ſhould read היא. A number of Church Fathers were quoted in favour of that opinion, from Ambroſe and Auſtin down to Bede and Bernard. But the authority of thoſe Fathers will never counterbalance that of the Hebr. and Sam. Texts, ſupported by all the verſions, except the Vulgate †; which itſelf has been corrupted from ſome erroneous copies of the old Italic: for Jerom every where reads *ipſe*. I ſay from ſome erroneous copies of the old Italic: becauſe Cyprian, and Lucifer of Cagliari, read *ipſe* in their copies. See Sabatier.

But how are we to account for *ipſa* getting into the Latin Text at all? Martianay accounts for it thus. In antient MSS. *ipſe* was ſometimes written *ipſae* with a diphthong. The final *e* was eaſily dropped; and left *ipſa* behind.—I ſhould rather think, that among the numerous Latin verſions, that were extant in the days of Auſtin, ſome copies might have had *ſtirpem* inſtead of *ſemen*; a word by which Jerom himſelf ſometimes renders זרע; and in that caſe *ipſa* would be the proper relative.—Be that as it will, הוא is moſt undoubtedly

* Roſenmüller miſtakes, when he ſays that ſix Sam. MSS. have this reading: on the contrary, thoſe ſix MSS. have the right, and common reading.

† Several copies of the Vulgate read *ipſe*, before the Clementine correction. See a long article on this word, in the Appendix to De Roſſi's fourth vol. of Var. Readings.

the

the original reading; and cannot be a feminine. It might be rendered in the maſculine *he*, if the antecedent were not a neuter: moſt copies of the Septuagint Greek ſo render, αυτος; and that is the only authority on which *ipſe* can be defended. I ſuſpect however that the right reading is αυτο, which is ſtill ſaid to be that of ſome copies *. The oriental dialects, having no neuter, muſt be underſtood according to the ſenſe: in all of them the relative correſponds with the antecedent *ſeed*. The Greek verſion of Venice has very properly εκεινο.

3. The words ישוף and תשוף are variouſly rendered by the antient tranſlators; but their verſions are all reducible to two; namely to *bruiſe*, and to *lay in wait for*, *conterere* and *obſervare*, or *inſidiari*. The Septuagint has τηρησει and τηρησεις †, which the ant. Ital. renders *ſervabit* and *ſervabis*; that is, *obſervabit* and *obſervabis*. Jerom in the firſt comma has *conteret*, in the ſecond *inſidiaberis*: and this latter ſeems to be, in both places, the genuine meaning. The other antient verſions, however, are either ambiguous, or lean to *conteret*. The Greek of Venice has alſo πληξει and πληξεις.—The original word occurs but in three places of ſcripture: here, Job 9. 17. and Pſ. 139. 11. As both theſe laſt may be reconciled to the meaning of *inſidiari*, much more eaſily than to that of *conterere*; I incline to think that the former, or ſome ſuch word, is the proper ſignification of שוף.—In my verſion, I have endeavoured to include both meanings.

On the doom of the woman I have nothing to remark; except what has been ſaid in my explanatory note. I will only add Roſenmüller's ingenious explanation of תשוקתך, &c. "*Ad "virum tuum curſus tuus.* שקק enim eſt *currere* aut *curſitare*: ſed quoniam ſervi circa heros, "ut imperata faciant, *curſitare* ſolent, nomen *curſus* tranſlatum eſt ad *obedientiam* eorum, qui "aliis ſubjecti ſunt."

Ver. 17. *Accurſed, with reſpect to thee, be the ground.* Inſtead of בעבורך, *with reſpect to thee*, or *on thy account*, the Septuagint ſeem to have read in their copy בעבודיך, *in thy labours*; and Jerom in the ſingular, *in opere tuo*: which is no inept reading.

Ver. 18. The addition *thy* before *bread* is only in Sept. and one of De Roſſi's MSS. by the firſt hand: yet I have no doubt of its having been originally in the Text. לחם bread, in ſuch like phraſes, is rarely without the affix. Comp. Job 20. 14. Pſ. 102. 4. al. 101. 5. Eccl. 9. 7. "Eat *thy* bread with joy." And Ezek. "Son of man, eat *thy* bread with quaking," &c.

Ver. 20. I have taken the liberty to tranſpoſe this verſe to the place where I ſuppoſe it originally ſtood. Whether that ſuppoſition be well or ill founded, is of little conſequence. The narration is evidently mended by the tranſpoſition; and they who diſlike it may replace the verſe where it was.

Ver. 22. *Lo! Adam*—or *man*—*is become like one of us.* If there be any paſſage in the Old Teſtament which countenances a plurality of perſons in the Godhead; or, to ſpeak more properly, a plurality of Gods, it is this paſſage. He does not ſay ſimply *like us*; but like *one of us* כאחד ממנו. This can hardly be explained as we have explained נעשה *Let us make*, ch. 1. 26. and I confeſs it has always appeared to me to imply a plurality of Gods, in ſome ſenſe or other. It is well known that The *Lord*, or *Jehovah*, is called in the Hebrew ſcriptures "The God

* See Bos, and the edition of Wechel, 1597. It was the reading of Theophylactus.

† Except the Complutenſian edition, which has τειρησει and τειρησεις.

"of

" of Gods." He is alſo repreſented as a Sovereign " ſitting on his throne, attended by all " the heavenly hoſt;" in Job called *the Sons of God*; i. e. *Gods*; as *prophets* are called *the ſons of the prophets*; and, in Greek, *phyſicians*, the *ſons of the phyſicians*.—We may readily conceive, then, that ſome of thoſe Gods, probably angels of the ſuperiour order, would accompany their Sovereign in his ſuppoſed excurſions to the earth; more eſpecially when he was to hold a court, as we may ſay, and pronounce judgment on guilty Man. This ſuppoſition is perfectly agreeable to other paſſages of Hebrew ſcripture: wherever Jehovah is preſent, whether on Sinai or in Zion, there he is attended by " twenty thouſand angels" of the cherubic order. Pſ. 68. 17.—When he appeared to Jacob at Bethel, he was attended by angels. Gen. 28. 12. And, when he deigned to wreſtle with the ſame patriarch, he had a whole camp, or camps, of angels at hand. Gen. 32. 1, 30.—To his attendants, then, his courtiers and miniſters, he may readily be ſuppoſed to have addreſſed theſe words: " Lo! Adam is ſo far become like one of us, as " to know good and evil." He has, in ſpite of my ſtrict prohibition, dared to taſte of a fruit which was reſerved for me and my *ſons* *; and fitted only to our ſuperiour ſtate: let us, at leaſt, prevent him from being like us, *immortal*, by having free acceſs to the *tree of life*. Let him be for ever expelled from this delightful paradiſe, this garden of the Gods†; and let the avenue to the *tree of life* be guarded by a ſentry of cherubs, to prevent him and his offſpring from future encroachments on our prerogatives.—Whether the word לעולם, which I have tranſlated *for ages*, was deſigned by our author to expreſs what we call *eternity*, or only a long period of years; and whether man, if he had not tranſgreſſed, was, in the writer's idea, to have been abſolutely immortal, or not; I will not take upon me to determine: nor is the queſtion, in my apprehenſion, of any moment. It is certain that עולם means any long or remote period, anterior or poſterior; and correſponds exactly with the Latin *olim*; or, rather, it is the ſame word.

Ver. 21. *The Lord God made garments of ſkins, &c.* Some have imagined that theſe ſkins were the ſkins or barks of trees. I ſee no reaſon for departing from the common acceptation. Skins were moſt probably the firſt garments uſed; and God is ſaid to make what he teaches man to make. Man, expelled from Paradiſe, was now to till a ground over-run with *thiſtles and thorns*, and to be expoſed to all the exceſſes of heat and cold, which, we may ſuppoſe, were not known or felt in the garden of Eden: clothing was therefore neceſſary to defend him from external injuries, as well as to hide his nakedneſs: and the Lord, pitying his new condition, ſhows him, that is, gives to him the idea of making garments of ſkins, inſtead of an ill-patched waiſt-girdle of fig-tree leaves.

We have now got to the end of the *mythos* of Moſes; or whoever elſe was the author of the wonderful production. I truſt that I have done ſomething like juſtice to its beauties; and that it will appear, on the whole, to be a well deviſed, well delineated, well executed piece: nay, that it has not its equal in all the mythology of antiquity: I mean, if it be conſidered, not as a real hiſtory, nor as a mere myſtical allegory; but, ſuch as I have throughout exhibited it, a moſt charming political fiction, dreſſed up for excellent purpoſes in the garb of hiſtory, and

* I mean, in the ſenſe before mentioned.

† See Gen. 14. 10.

adapted to the groſs conceptions and limited capacity of a rude, ſenſual and unlearned credulous people*.

I have endeavoured to be as brief as poſſible; nor have I dwelt on any thing that ſeemed not to be of ſome importance: yet I fear, that to ſome readers I may appear to have exceeded due bounds; and it will poſſibly be ſaid: "If our Remarker goes on at this rate, he will "never have done. Three chapters only are yet remarked on; and yet we are at the 50th "page of the volume."—Be not alarmed, my good reader! I ſhall not again have occaſion to be ſo tedious.—Let us commence a new career.

CHAP. IV.

Ver. 1. *I HAVE acquired a god-like man-child.* Lit. I have acquired a man-god. The preſent text, indeed, has, *I have acquired a man, Jehova*; or *a man, the Lord:* קניתי איש את יהוה and this is the reading of all the antient verſions, ſave the Septuagint, both Arabs †, and the Latin Vulgate, which have *God* inſtead of the *Lord*. This reading I ſtrongly ſuſpect to be the true one; both becauſe the word יהוה was not known to Heva, nor to any of the Patriarchs ‡; and becauſe the word אלהים has, in ſeveral other places, been changed into יהוה by the Jewiſh tranſcribers. Indeed, if neither the Greek nor the Arabic, nor the Vulgate §, read אלהים, I ſhould ſtill be inclined to deem יהוה a ſpurious lection; and ſhould think that the original word muſt have been חיה, which would make a ſenſe not only conſiſtent, but perfectly analogous: *I have acquired a living man:* hence well might ſhe be called *Heva*, the *life-giver*.

But ſuppoſing אלהים *God* to be the true reading, what is here the meaning of את אלהים? The Greek tranſlators render it συν θεῳ, both Arabs עונ אללה, and the Vulg. *per Deum*. And the other tranſlators, who read יהוה render את nearly in the ſame manner; Sam. verſ. מיהוה, Onk. מן־קדם י, Perſ. אז חצרת י, Gr. Ven. ξυν τῳ οντωτῃ.

Moſt modern tranſlators and interpreters have adopted this mode of rendering; making את an ellipſis for מאת; as if Heva had ſaid; "Through the favour of the Lord, I have gotten a "man-child."—This is ſpecious, but in my opinion more ſpecious than ſolid. For, in the firſt place, the few examples that are produced of ſuch an ellipſis, from Gen. 44. 4.—49. 25. Deut. 34. 1. and 2 Kings, 23. 35. are feeble props on which to build an hypotheſis. In the firſt example, the יצאו את העיר may readily be explained without making את an ablative pre-

* I have tranſpoſed verſes 20 and 21, and placed them at the end of the chapter; not becauſe I am certain that they ſtood ſo originally, but becauſe in their preſent poſition they disjoint the narrative; and becauſe, wherever they be placed, they evidently refer to a future period. "Quidquid de occaſione nominis (*Heva*) impoſiti, de tempore dubitari "vix poteſt; nempe in Paradiſo hoc minimè factum eſſe." Dathe. It was not, probably, until Heva became a mother, that ſhe had her new name.—Eichhorn is of a different opinion.

† It is ſomewhat ſingular that *Arab. Erpen.* has this reading; as he tranſlated from the Hebrew at a much later period than either the Septuagint or Jerom; and who, as he tranſlates very literally, muſt have read, it ſhould ſeem, אלהים, not יהוה, in his Hebrew copy.

‡ See the Rem. on Exod. 6. 3.

§ That the reading of Sep. and Vulg. was the ſame with that of the Hebrew Text in Jerom's copy, is plain from his not remarking the difference in his *Queſtions* on Geneſis, as he does in ver. 7.

poſition,

poſition, as Helvicus has well ſhewn. "Nego ellipſim eſſe in Gen. 44. 4. ſed ſicut Latini "dicunt *exire limen*, Terent.; *exire campum*, Statius; *egredi leges*, Tacitus; ita etiam Hebræi יצאו את העיר *exierunt urbem*." So indeed both the Septuagint and Jerom render; εξηλθοντων δε αυτων την πολιν—*Jamque urbem exierant*. I ſhall only further remark, that four of Kennicott's MSS. have מן inſtead of את.

The ſecond example is a faulty reading: for all the Sam. copies, four Hebrew MSS. and almoſt all the antient verſions read not את, but אל, which, I am convinced, is the true reading. In the third example there is ſuch a variety of lection, that it is not eaſy to ſay, which is the true one: but granting that את were the true one, it would not follow, that it is an ablative. See Remark on the place.

In the fourth example את is evidently the ſign of the accuſative; "he taxed *the* land."

There is not then a ſingle clear example, that את is ever an ellipſis for מאת.—But does not את ſimply, ſometimes denote the ablative caſe? and that even in the Pentateuch? I anſwer, No. It ſometimes ſignifies *with*; as "Henoch walked *with* God,"—"Noah walked *with* God:" but *with* is not properly an ablative prepoſition. And were it ſuch, it could never be commuted with *from*, or *by the favour of*, or even *with the aſſiſtance of*; as any one may eaſily convince himſelf, by turning to all the places where את ſignifies *with*.—Nay מאת itſelf has never, I believe, the ſignification here given to את. It is not מאת but ב, that is generally uſed for *through*, or *by the favour of*: as Pſ. 60. 12. "Through God, באלהים, we ſhall do "valiantly." See alſo Deut. 33. 29. Iſ. 45. 17. Jerem. 3. 23.—The acute Luther ſaw this; but, puzzled with the preſent reading יהוה, he imagined that Heva thought Cain was the *Lord, the Meſſiah*, ſuppoſed to be promiſed ch. 2. ver. 15. and he renders accordingly "Ich habe den "mann, den Herrn."—This opinion was adopted by Pellicanus and others; and has been latterly defended by Parkhurſt in his Hebrew Lexicon: and Jonathan Ben-Uziel may be ſaid to have preceded them: for, in his Thargum, he renders thus קניתי לגבריא ית מאלכא דיי "I have acquired a man, the angel of the Lord." The Syr. too, has קנית גברא למריא which is badly tranſlated in the Polyglott *poſſedi virum Domino*. For although ל be the ſign of the dative, as well as of the accuſative, it ſeems here to be that of the latter: for what is the ſenſe of "I have acquired a man, to the Lord?"—However this be, the Hebrew את cannot be here underſtood, but as the ſign of the accuſative: and, this being the caſe, we muſt render with the preſent text "I have acquired a man, Jehovah," or, reading אלהים inſtead of יהוה, "I have acquired a man, a God," that is, "a god-like man-child." That אלהים is the genuine original reading is to me clear, not only for the reaſons already given, but becauſe יהוה is never uſed to denote a human being; although it is often uſed to denote an angel as the viſible repreſentative and meſſenger of Jehovah; whereas nothing is more common than the application of אלהים to the human race. "I ſay: ye even are *Gods*; and all of you chil-"dren of the Moſt High." Pſ. 82. 6.—Heva muſt have been ſtruck with admiration, on ſeeing her firſt child, ſo perfectly reſembling her huſband, who had been created after the likeneſs of God; and who, in Luke's genealogy of Chriſt, is ſaid to be "the *Son* of God."—It was therefore natural for her to exclaim: "I have gotten a male child of a god-like form."

Verſes 4, 5. I have nothing to add to what I have ſaid in my explanatory note on the ſacrifices of Cain and Abel: but that Joſephus thus expreſſes himſelf: ὁ δε Θεος ταυτῃ μαλλον ἡδεται τῃ θυσιᾳ,

τῃ θυσιᾳ, τοις αυτοματοις και κατα φυσιν γεγονοσιν τιμωμενος, αλλ' ουχι τοις κατα επινοιαν ανθρωπου πλεονεκτου κατα βιαν πεφυκοσιν. That is, God is better pleaſed with the natural growth of the earth, than with that which the avarice of man forces it to produce: and hence it is not improbable that Joſephus underſtood his text, as the Septuagint did in ver. 7, although he has not given us any verſion of it. Cain did not properly *diſcriminate* what was to be offered in ſacrifice: ορθως μη εδιελει.

Ver. 7. *Doth not one, &c.* Of this difficult paſſage I have, in my explanatory notes, given three different verſions, beſide my own: I muſt here review and examine them more minutely.

The firſt is that of the Septuagint. Ουκ εαν ορθως προσενεγκῃς, ορθως δε μη διελῃς, ἡμαρτες; ἡσιχασον· προς σε ἡ αποστροφη (or επιστροφη) αυτου, και συ αρξεις αυτου, which in the old Italic verſion, as quoted by Auſtin, is thus rendered: "Nonne, ſi rectè offeras, rectè autem non dividas, peccaſti? Quiſce: ad te enim converſio ejus, et tu dominaberis illius *."

To Voſſius, and our Dawſon, this tranſlation appeared ſo ſatisfactory, that they are aſtoniſhed we ſhould ſeek for any other; and I confeſs, that were there a ל before שאת as there is before לפתח, I ſhould be inclined to acquieſce in their opinion. I have ſo great a reſpect for the Greek tranſlators of the Pentateuch, that, although I do not conſider them as either inſpired or infallible, I am ever unwilling to abandon them without ſome cogent reaſon. Let us ſuppoſe then that in their Hebrew copy they either read לשאת or conſidered שאת as equivalent to it; and that, inſtead of לפתח, they read לפתת or לכתת; I cannot ſee how they could have rendered otherwiſe than they have done. For, in the firſt place, it is certain that the coactive voice of יטב, in conſtruction with an infinitive, muſt commonly be rendered in the ſame manner as here: that is, as Parkhurſt well expreſſes it; it denotes the *doing of that action well*, ορθως, which the infinitive expreſſes; as היטבת לראות Καλως ἑωρακας, *Thou haſt well ſeen.* Jer. i. 12.

My two objections to this rendering are; Firſt, that I nowhere elſe find שאת or even לשאת uſed to denote *offering* a ſacrifice. It is true that משאת ſignifies a *gift, donative, preſent*; and the offering of Cain is ſaid, ver. 4. to be a *gift-offering*: but then the Hebrew word there is not משאת but מנחה, and which is always uſed to denote a *donative* or *gift-offering* made to the Lord.—Secondly, What is the meaning of *not rightly to divide?* Bonfrerius tells us: "He doth "not rightly divide, who giveth the worſt to the Lord, and keepeth the beſt to himſelf." I doubt if the ſqueamiſh critic will reliſh this explanation. More rational is the idea of Joſephus; that Cain had not properly *diſcriminated* what things ſhould be offered; and the word uſed by the Septuagint may be ſo underſtood: for διαιρεω is ſometimes equivalent to διακρινω, and the tranſlation quoted from Gregory VII. (in the note below) *dijudices*, would, then, be a more proper verſion than the *dividas* of Auſtin.

Having thus done juſtice to the rendering of the Greek tranſlators; let us ſee how the other antient interpreters underſtood the paſſage. I ſhall begin by the Latin Vulgate; becauſe it has in this paſſage been adopted, either in the whole or in part, by almoſt all modern tranſ-

* It is very remarkable that Gregory VII. as late as 1081, quotes the firſt part of this verſe nearly in the ſame manner: "Si rectè offeras, et rectè non *dijudices*, peccaſti:" which is not noticed by Sabatier: but which ſeems a proof that the Italic verſion was occaſionally uſed by the writers of the Latin Church much longer than is generally imagined. See Greg. Epiſt. lib. 9. ep. 24. apud Labbe Concil. Gen. tom. 10. p. 294.

lators.

lators. " Nonne, ſi benè egeris, recipies? ſin autem malè, ſtatim in foribus peccatum aderit? " Sed ſub te erit appetitus ejus, et tu dominaberis illius." Which the Doway tranſlators thus render into Engliſh: " If thou doe wel, ſhalt thou not receive again? but if thou doſt il, " ſhall not thy ſinne forthwith be preſent at the dore? But the luſt thereof ſhall be under thee; " and thou ſhalt have dominion over it." Where they ſubjoin a long note againſt the *heretical tranſlation* of our latter* Engliſh Bibles; and in favour of *free-will*; which, they think, is clearly implied in the words *ſub te erit appetitus ejus, &c.* And, indeed, they can hardly bear any other meaning, as they ſtand in the Vulgate. That this was the meaning of Jerom† is clear from his paraphraſe of the words, in his *Queſtions on Geneſis:* " Quod ſi malè egeris, illico " peccatum ante veſtibulum tuum ſedebit, et tali janitore comitaberis: verum, quia liberi ar- " bitrii es; moneo ut non tibi peccatum, ſed tu peccato domineris."

Jerom ſeems to have borrowed the firſt part of his verſion from Theodotion's *ουκ, εαν αγαθως ποιης, δεκτον· και, εαν μη αγαθως ποιης, επι θυρας αμαρτια εγκαθηται.* But he abandons him in the ſecond part: for Theodotion follows, in other words, the ſenſe of the Septuagint *ωρος σε ορμη αυτω, και αρξεις αυτω.* Theod. apud Montefalc. where there is a miſprint *εγκατηται* for *εγκαθηται.*

The Syriac verſion has a ſingular reading in the laſt member of the verſe. Inſtead of making Cain ſubdue ſin, it makes ſin ſubdue Cain: unleſs the tranſlator meant to ſay, that *Abel* and not *ſin* ſhould have dominion over *Cain:* of which ſenſe indeed his verſion is ſuſceptible אות תתפנא לותה׳ והו נשתלט בך.

Both Arabs, and the Chaldee paraphraſts (for Onkelos, here, is as wildly paraphraſtic as Jonathan) ſeem to have underſtood the Text, although allegorically, in much the ſame manner as Jerom.—And the Greek verſion of Venice renders the firſt part of the verſe like the Vulgate; but the laſt like the Septuagint, *ωρος σε δ' ἡ εφεσις αυτου,* (not *αυτης*) *συ τ' αρξεις αυτου.*

With reſpect to modern tranſlators, thoſe even who tranſlated from the Hebrew have generally followed the Vulgate; with the variation of a word or two; namely *venia,* or *condonetur,* for *recipies;* and *pœna* for *peccatum.* So, with others, Houbigant: " aderit in foribus " pœna:" i. e. the puniſhment due to ſin will immediately follow it; *culpam pœna premit comes.* The puniſhment of ſin lying at the ſinner's door, then, is a very intelligible metaphor; and makes this part of the verſe run ſmoothly enough: but how ſhall the puniſhment's *deſire be ſubject* to the ſinner? and how ſhall he *have dominion over it?* The two parts of the ſentence are thus ſet at variance; and the whole thereby rendered, to me, unintelligible.

* I ſay *latter* Engliſh Bibles: for all our tranſlations from Tyndal's to the Biſhops' Bible (Coverdale excepted) follow the meaning of the Vulgate. I ſhall give that of Cranmer's Bible as the moſt explicit of all. " Unto thee alſo " pertayneth the luſt thereof; and thou ſhalt have dominion over *it.*"—But the Geneva tranſlators changed *it* into *his;* and rendered " alſo unto thee *his* deſire [ſhall be ſubject] and thou ſhalt rule over *him:* which verſion was equivalently adopted by James's tranſlators; but rejected by Gell in his *Eſſay toward the Amendment of the laſt Tranſlation of the Bible,* p. 35.

† I muſt here remark, that Jerom's own verſion differs in ſome words from that of the Vulgate, thus: " Nonne, ſi " benè egeris, demittetur tibi? et ſi non benè egeris, ante fores peccatum tuum ſedebit? Et ad te ſocietas ejus: ſed tu " magis dominare ejus." Queſt. Hebr. in Gen.

Grotius,

Grotius, whoſe ſuperior penetration and judgment could not but perceive ſomething uncouth and perplexed in the paſſage, imagined that a parenthetical diſtinction would ſet all right. "Repetendum ex eo quod præceſſit: *ſi bene egeris:* ut ſenſus ſit, ſi bene egeris, "Abelis voluntas tuo imperio ſubjecta erit, ut fratris minoris; ita illa, *ſin autem malè, &c.* "erunt dicta παρενθετικως, qualia in his libris multa occurrunt."—Parentheſes are indeed frequent in the Hebrew writings: but I very much doubt if there be any of this ſtamp.

Le Clerc ſaw this, and tried to remove the perplexity by ſeparating, with the LXX, רבץ from לפתח; and rendering: "Nonne, ſi benè te geſſeris, dignitatem tueberis? ſin autem benè te "non geſſeris, peccatum eſt ad fores? Quiſce; et curſus ejus [Abelis] erit ad te; tuque ei "dominaberis." This is not only ingenious, but founded on grammatical analogy: and I find it adopted by ſome latter interpreters. Yet *ſin lying at the door*, which he retains from the Vulgate, lies ſo heavy on my ſtomach, that I cannot digeſt it: for the following reaſons.

1. If one have already ſinned, how can ſin be ſaid only to lie at his door, "crouching like "a monſter," as Le Gros expreſſes it *; when he has already entered and devoured his prey? A conſcientiouſneſs of guilt might, with ſome propriety, be ſaid to lie at the ſinner's door: but then he would not be deſired to ſubdue it: on the contrary, he would be deſired to yield to its admonitions.

2. The conſtruction of חטאת רבץ, a maſculine with a feminine, is at leaſt unuſual; and, I think, altogether ungrammatical. I know that Jerom makes חטאת a maſculine; and aſſerts that the Greek tranſlators erred for want of attention to this. "Quod autem in Septuaginta "interpretibus fecit errorem, illud eſt: quia peccatum, i. e. ATTATH, in Hebræo, generis "maſculini eſt, in Græco, feminini."—No, learned father! the Greek tranſlators were not deceived: they did not conſider ATTATH as a feminine at all: they took it for what it is, the 2 perſ. maſc. of the verb חטא: and, conſequently, αποστροφη αυτου could have no relation to ἡμαρτια *ſin*; but to *Abel*; as Cyril and Chryſoſtom † rightly underſtood it; and which is now generally allowed to be the meaning, by thoſe even who adhere to Jerom's verſion, in what precedes ‡.—But is there not one example, at leaſt, beſide this, of חטאת in the maſculine gender, namely Amos 5. 12., where חטאותיכם is in conſtruction with עצמים? It is ſo; but the circumſtance is ſingular. The writer had juſt before uſed רבים פשעיכם both maſculines: it

* Or, as Roſenmüller: "Prava concupiſcentia inſidiatur tibi, quemadmodum ſolent beſtiæ præ cubile jacentes præ-"tereuntibus inſidiari."

† See this father's elegant paraphraſe and explanation of the whole paſſage in his 18th Homily on Geneſis.

‡ The manner in which the Benedictine editor of Jerom explains and juſtifies that father is perfectly ridiculous. "Neſcio (ſays he) an aliquis, ante nos, hunc Hieronymi locum lectori expoſuerit. Obſervat igitur S. Doctor, quod "multo alias in Hebræo, quam in LXX tranſlatoribus, ſenſus eſt: cauſamque erroris apud LXX poſitam eſſe dicit in voce "Hebr. ATTATH, vel HHATTATH; quæ peccatum ſignificat, et eſt generis maſculini apud Hebræos; quum ἁμαρτια "ſit gen. fem. apud Græcos: cui nihilominus verbo reſpondet relativum maſculinum αυτου: et hoc ipſiſſimum eſt, quod "docet Hieronymus, dicens: *Et qui interpretati ſunt* (nempe LXX) *maſculino illud, ut erat in Hebræo, genere tranſtule-"runt.* Quamvis enim LXX tranſlatores verbum Hebr. HHATTAH legerint in 2 perſ. maſc. ſing. præt. ἡμαρτες: con-"ſequenter tamen, addentes προς σε ἡ αποστροφη αυτου, *peccatum* intelligunt; illique relativum maſc. αυτου adjungere "ſtuduerunt juxta Hebræum affixum maſc. quod reſpondet vocibus HHATTATH ROBETS: i. e. *peccatum cubans.*"—All this is *gratis dictum*—a double *petitio principii*; and a miſapprehenſion of Jerom beſides, with reſpect to the words *Et qui interpretati ſunt*, &c. which relate not to the LXX but to the other Greek tranſlators—as every acute reader muſt ſee at the firſt glance.

was,

was, therefore, natural to place עצמים alſo in the maſculine; although the following word was in the feminine. This is only a *ſyllepſis generum*, not uncommon in other languages; and cannot be brought as a proof that חטאת is a maſculine noun.—It is further obſervable, that חטא, in the maſculine gender, is often uſed to expreſs *ſin*, as well as חטאת: hence, from the aſſociation of ideas, a maſculine adjective might occur to the writer, amidſt ſo many other maſculines; and, indeed, be no ſoleciſm againſt the idiom of the language.—It will be urged, perhaps, Why do I not allow the ſame licence with reſpect to the ſingular חטאת in the text before us? I anſwer, Becauſe it is not ſo circumſtanced, nor in a ſimilar conſtruction; and becauſe, if it were a real *maſculine*, it would not make a tolerable ſenſe, connected as it is with רבץ, and לפתח. For,

3. The genuine Hebrew mode of expreſſing *at the door* is not לפתח, but ſimply פתח, and ſometimes פתחה. The words לפתח and אל פתח ſignify *to*, *unto*, and *for the door:* but never *at the door*.—I ſay never; becauſe the exceptions are ſo few, that they ſcarcely deſerve to be mentioned. In the Pentateuch, where the phraſe ſo frequently occurs, there is but a ſingle example, Num. 11. 10.; and even there 3 MSS. have the uſual reading פתח: and, in the whole body of Hebrew ſcripture, there are, I think, but two more; namely, Joſh. 8. 29. and Prov. 9. 14., in both which places the meaning is ambiguous, and may have a greater latitude than *juſt at* or *by the door:* they may denote any place without the door; although not at a great diſtance from it: not to mention that, here alſo, there is ſome variety of lection.

4. The true meaning of רבץ is not *to couch*, as if lying in wait for prey: even when it is applied to beaſts of prey. Thus Gen. 49. 9. "Judah! like a lion, from the prey thou returneſt—"when, like a lion, he *quietly coucheth*, who ſhall rouſe him from his reſt?"—So Pſal. 104. 21, 22. "The young lions (in the night-time) roar after their prey—but as ſoon as the ſun is "riſen, *they lay themſelves down, to reſt*, ירבצון in their dens." And Iſaiah 11. 16. "The "leopard ſhall *lie down* ירבץ with the kid."—The ſame prophet, 14. 30. ſaith: "The needy "ſhall *lie down* ירבצו in ſafety." And Zophaniah, ſpeaking of the remainder of the Iſraelites, ſaith: "They ſhall feed, and *lie down* ורבצו, and none ſhall make them afraid."—In Hiphil alſo, or the coactive voice; Pſ. 23. 2. "He *maketh me lie down* ירבצני in verdant paſtures." In Prov. 24. 15. רבץ is the *reſt*, or *reſting-place* of the righteous: and מרבץ in Jerem. 50. 6. is uſed in the ſame ſenſe.—In ſhort, there is not an inſtance, where רבץ is taken in the ſenſe here aſſigned to it: but it always denotes *reſt* and *tranquillity*; except when it is applied to the mere *falling down* of under a burthen, or through fear; as in the inſtance of Balaam's aſs.

On the whole, then, Jerom's verſion, with all the improvements that have been made on it, is, in my apprehenſion, more objectionable than that of the Septuagint.

Some moderns have tried to mend the matter, by rendering חטאת neither *ſin*, nor *puniſhment*; but a *ſin-offering:* as if God had ſaid, Is not a *ſin-offering* at the door; that is, *at hand*, to atone for the evil thou haſt done? But this rendering is liable to the ſame objections with the preceding ones: I therefore now come to my

Own Verſion; in order to juſtify which I muſt obſerve, firſt, that, from the context, we naturally expect a contraſt, or antiparalleliſm; I mean the different conſequences of having done *well*, and *ill*.—Secondly, the word שאת, without a præfix, either always, or almoſt always, denotes

notes *elevation, dignity, confidence* *: we muſt therefore look, in the following comma, for a word denoting the contrary; *depreſſion, dejection, confuſion.* Now I find that preciſe ſignification in the word לפת. For although in Hebrew it occurs but ſeldom, and in a lax and ambiguous ſenſe, its meaning is ſufficiently clear in the Arabic; in which it denotes the very thing wanted, *averſion, depreſſion, contortion of countenance.*—Without changing a letter in the text but one, a ח into a ה, I read and diſtinguiſh thus: הלוא׳ אם תיטיב׳ שאת׳ ואם לא תיטיב׳ לפת׳ החטאת׳ רבץ׳ ואליך תשוקתו׳ ואתה תמשל בו. which may be literally rendered: "Nonne, ſi "benè feceris, *elevatio?* ſi vero non benè feceris, *dejectio?* Peccaſtine? Quieſce: nam, &c."—The learned reader will obſerve, that I have detached the ח (changed into ה) from לפתח and prefixed it to the following word; which, in my opinion, gives a beauty and energy to the whole ſentence; and is perfectly conſonant with Hebrew phraſeology. We meet with a very ſimilar phraſe in the book of Eccleſiaſticus, chap. 21. 1. Τεκνον, ἡμαρτες; μη προσθεις μηκετι. "Son! haſt thou ſinned? do ſo no more:" which in the original Hebrew (for the Greek is only a tranſlation) muſt have ſtood thus: בני׳ החטאת? לא תוסופי עוד See Iſa. 23. 12. and Zophan. 3. 11.

I might have kept to the probable reading of the Septuagint לפתת, without any other change at all; and ſtill tranſlate as I do: for לפתת may ſignify *depreſſion of countenance* as well as לפת, and the interrogative ה is often ſuppreſſed; as in this caſe it would be before חטאת. But as ה is more eaſily changed into ח than ת, and has been often ſo changed, I prefer the reading above.—At any rate, I am convinced that I have given the true meaning of the text. Let others judge for themſelves.

But why, it will poſſibly be ſaid, have I tranſlated in the third perſon "Doth not one," &c.? I anſwer, Becauſe it is more agreeable to the Engliſh idiom—at leaſt ſo I think;—and, conſequently, more expreſſive of what is meant to be conveyed. It is well known that, in Hebrew, the third perſon is often uſed where we uſe the ſecond; and the ſecond where we uſe the third. In all ſuch caſes the ſenſe, and not the idiotiſm, ſhould be rendered.

Ver. 8. *Let us walk out into the fields,* נלכה השדה. Theſe words are wanting in the preſent Hebrew text; but are in the Sam. text and verſion; the LXX, the Syriac, the Vulgate, and in both the Thargums of Jonathan; yet our ſticklers for the integrity of the Hebrew text will have them, forſooth, to be an interpolation: although they appear abſolutely neceſſary to connect the ſentence. For how bald is the ſentence without them! "Cain ſaid יאמר to his "brother Abel—and when they were in the fields," &c. What ſaid Cain? Nothing at all!—Nay, but, (ſay Hottinger and his numerous party) the word יאמר is here equivalent to ידבר. Be it ſo: "And Cain ſpoke to his brother Abel—and when," &c. What ſpoke he? Still, nothing at all.—The example adduced by De Roſſi from Exod. 19. 25. "Deſcenditque Moſes "ad populum, dixitque ad eum," &c. *quin ſubjiciatur quid dixerit*; is evidently not to the pur-

* This has been ſeen by the beſt modern interpreters; among the firſt of whom I believe is Diodati in his French verſion: "Si tu fais bien, n'*y aura-t-il* pas exaltation?"—So Michaëlis: "Iſt es nicht wahr, wenn du gutes thuſt, ſo "cannſt du die augen in die höhe heben."—And Dathe: "Nonne, ſi benè feceris, capite erecto potes incedere?"—It is ſtrange, to me, that this did not lead them to examine more minutely the next *comma:* which if they had done, I am perſuaded that they would (abſit verbo invidia) have lighted on my conjecture.

poſe.

poſe. There was no need of ſubjoining what he ſaid; as it had been told before in the preceding verſe what he was to ſay: and we agree with De Roſſi that the Vulgate has rightly, *omnia nunciavit eis*. He told them, what God had told him.

Michaëlis thought we ſhould read ימר from מרר *amarus*; as if we ſhould ſay *amarus fuit animo*: but in order to have that meaning it ſhould be rather יתמרמר. Dathe imagines that the word אמר may be underſtood to mean, as in Arabic, *to ſpeak harſhly: Durè locutus eſt Cainus cum fratre ſuo.*

Delgado, an ingenious Jew of the preſent day, tranſpoſes the parts of the verſe thus: "And it came to paſs, when they were in the field, that Cain talked with Abel his brother; "and Cain roſe up," &c.

Such is the manner in which the integrity of the Hebrew text has been attempted to be defended, with reſpect to this paſſage.—But why ſo much uſeleſs and impotent labour? when the chaſm is ſo well filled up by the Samaritan copy and the moſt antient verſions; and where the more candid Jews themſelves acknowledge ſomething to be wanting. "There are, ſays "R. Immanuel (apud De Roſſi), who ſay, that Cain ſaid to Abel: 'Let us go out into the "fields' נצא השדה, which is equivalent to the נלכה השדה of the Samaritan.—Nay, in 27 MSS., and in nearly 40 printed editions, a vacant ſpace, ſmaller or greater, is left in the Hebrew text where theſe very words ſhould come in. I know that a ſtill greater number of MSS. have no ſuch vacant ſpace: but that is a poor argument againſt the authority of Sam. Sep. Syr. Vulg. the Thargums, the context and common ſenſe.

Ver. 10. *The voice of thy brother's blood crieth,* צעק ſo Sam. and all the antient verſions *; ſave Onkelos and the Thargums; who ſeem to have read with the preſent Heb. צעקים, correſponding not to קול but to דמים. Thoſe who prefer this reading may tranſlate with Delgado: "The voice of thy brother's blood, crying from the ground, *is come* to me." But the other is more natural; and needs no ſupplemental italics.

The puniſhment inflicted on Cain is double. The ground where his brother's blood was ſhed is rendered barren with reſpect to him; to his toil it ſhall not yield its product. Adam had been condemned to "eat his bread in the ſweat of his face:" but Cain's ſweat ſhall not be able to procure him bread on the ſoil by him contaminated. This is the preciſe idea which the antient Greeks had of wilful murder. Sterility and famine were the uſual conſequences. See Sophocles's Oedipus Tyran. 24 et ſeq.—Secondly, he is doomed to be "a reſtleſs fugitive," an exile from his natal ſpot; which was by the antients accounted the greateſt puniſhment which the gods could inflict. See a beautiful paſſage of Euripides, put in the mouth of Oreſtes, in Iphigen. in Taur. quoted by Grotius in his Commentary; and whoſe elegant Latin verſion of it I ſhall here lay before my reader:

——————— Furiarum impetu
Agitabar exſul, patrio extorris ſolo:
Multoſque flexus curſuum impleram, miſer;
Cum te rogavi, quomodo finem aſſequi
Poſſem vagi furoris et cruciatuum
Quos, Græciæ omnis terminos obiens, tuli.

* Even the Arabic of Erpenius and the Greek of Venice, both literal verſions from the Hebrew.

See alſo Sophocles in the tragedy already mentioned, ver. 833.

... . ει με χρη φυγειν,
Και μοι φυγοντι μητε τας εμας ιδειν,
Μητ' εμβατευειν πατριδος——

Ver. 13. *My puniſhment is too great to be borne.*—It ſometimes happens that a tranſlator, at leaſt to me it has happened, is doubtful, which, of two readings that preſent themſelves, is the more proper one.—The word עון, which I render *puniſhment*, more frequently denotes *perverſeneſs*, or *iniquity*: and in that ſenſe it ſeems to have been underſtood here, by all antient interpreters: Sep. αιτια*, Syr. כבלות, Onk. חוב, Arab. Pol. דנב, Arab. Erp. דנוב, Perſ. כנאה, Vulg. *iniquitas*. Gr. Ven. αμπλακημα: and, in this, they have been implicitly followed by the bulk of modern commentators; among whom our Engliſh tranſlators, before James's; which laſt adopted the verſion of Junius and the French of Geneva; and threw the common one into the margin.

As this common rendering makes Cain talk like a perſon in deſpair; and has often been quoted, by preachers and polemics, as the firſt inſtance of that crime; ſome more charitable interpreters have tried to ſoften the expreſſion, by rendering interrogatively: "Is my ſin then "too great, to be forgiven?" So Michaëlis in his German verſion, "Iſt meine ſchuld zu groſs, "als daſs ſie vergeben werden könnte?"—But as no copy has been found with the interrogative præfix; and as all the antients ſeem to have read poſitively †; I would not readily admit this verſion.—Obliged, however, to make a choice, and after having conſidered the texture and conſtruction of the paſſage, I have preferred the meaning given to עון and מנשוא by Aben-Ezrah, Oleaſter, Piſcator, Calvin, Diodati, Junius, and our laſt tranſlators; both becauſe it is more natural in itſelf ‡, and becauſe it correſponds better with the context than any other: "My puniſhment is too great to be borne: for, lo! thou now exileſt me," &c.

Ver. 14. *It will happen, that whoſoever may meet with me, will kill me.* I have obſerved, in my explanatory note, that, according to Joſephus, Cain was afraid of the wild beaſts: and this idea was adopted by Michaëlis. I cannot think that the text bears any ſuch meaning. Cain was afraid that ſome of Abel's offspring (for there is no proof that Abel had no children), or one of his own brothers (for Adam had more ſons than Cain, Abel and Seth), would retaliate on him; and demand his blood for that of Abel: eſpecially when removed "from "the preſence of God," that is, from the ſpot where Adam reſided §; which, being in the neighbourhood of Eden, was, according to the Hebrew theology, more immediately under the eyes of the Divinity: who is ſtill made to converſe, now and then, with mankind: even in the ſilver and brazen ages: as we ſhall ſee throughout the whole Jewiſh hiſtory, unto the Babyloniſh captivity; although much leſs frequently than in the patriarchal and Moſaic ages.

To free Cain from the apprehenſion of being killed, God replies, ver. 15. "Not ſo;" לא כן. for ſo I read with Sep. Syr. Theod. Sym. and Vulg.—The preſent text, in both Sam. and Heb. copies, has לכן, which our tranſlators render *therefore:* but I think, with Dathe, that לכן can-

* One of Holmes's MSS. has αμαρτια; and ſo it is quoted by Origen and Theodoret.

† I own this alone would not be a ſure argument: it is only a preſumptive one.

‡ A very ſimilar phraſe occurs in the *Ajax* of Sophocles 1306. το γαρ νοσημα μειζον η φερειν.

§ "In domo paterna fortaſſe tutus fuiſſet; ſed cum ex ea ejiceretur, utique vindictam poterat metuere." Roſenmüller.

not

not be here rendered *therefore:* "Quia Deus reſpondet ad præcedentem Caini ſermonem: neque "ſatis aptè per particulam affirmandi *ſane, utique*; quam ſignificationem interdum habet."—Houbigant renders "Omnino; is qui Cain interficiet," &c.

"*Not ſo; whoſoever killeth Cain ſhall incur ſevenfold vengeance.*" This was a moſt wiſe warning: eſpecially in the infancy of population. Had the ſanguinary law of talion been allowed in this inſtance, it might have ended in the deſtruction of the whole race.

The moſt ingenious Eichhorn, in the tract already quoted, endeavours to ſhew, that this colloquy between God and Cain is all ideal; and only indicates the effects and conſequences of Cain's guilty conſcience: and I deny not, that this explanation is not at all incompatible with the oriental mode of writing. I am, however, inclined to believe that the writer meant to impreſs on the mind of his reader a real converſation; although that converſation may never have happened. What I have ſaid of the *Creation*, and the *Fall*, is equally applicable to the ſtory of Cain.

Ver. 15. *And the Lord gave a token* of ſecurity *to Cain.* The common tranſlation is: "The "Lord *ſet a mark* upon Cain." The original cannot admit of this interpretation. For there is not a ſingle paſſage in the Bible where אות ſignifies a *mark* or *brand* ſet on one. It always denotes a *ſign*, a *token*, a *wonderful event:* but never a *mark* *. And although שום ſignifies to *place* or *ſet*; it has often a meaning like that of נתן; and ישם אות is here equivalent to יתן אות; and ſuch is its ſignification wherever it is connected with the word אות. See Pſal. 74. 4.—78. 43.—105. 27. and Iſa. 66. 19.

The Septuagint verſion, which has εθετο, ſeems to have miſled all the reſt: although I am not ſure but itſelf has been miſunderſtood. Certain it is that Cyril of Alexandria thought εθετο here equivalent to δεδωκε, or read the latter in his copy: αλλαι δεδωκε (φησιν) ὁ Θεος σημειον τῳ Καειν. Glaph. l. 1. tom. 1. p. 17.—Joſephus indeed and the Syr. verſion are clear for a *mark*. The former has σημειον επιβαλων, ὡς γνωριμος αν ειη. The latter בקין אתא מריא וסם, and ſo nearly the other verſions down to the Greek of Venice. Save that both the Arabs and Vulgate may bear the explanation which I have given; and which I am ſatisfied is the only true one. Purver, Bate, Dawſon, and Dathe concur with me. The verſion of the laſt is: "Deinde, ſigno "quodam coram Caino edito, eum certiorem fecit, quod nem o,qui fortè in eum incideret, "eum eſſet interfecturus."

The genealogy, through ſix generations, from Cain to Lamech, ſeems to have been introduced by the Hebrew hiſtorian, for the purpoſe of noticing the firſt ſuppoſed polygamiſt; and his ſons; who are ſaid to have been the inventors of certain arts. The ſpeech of Lamech to his wives comes in ſo abruptly, that there is reaſon to ſuſpect that ſomething has been loſt, or forgotten, in the traditional ſtory. Many remarkable ſayings have been preſerved in every language, long after that which gave riſe to them is no more known. Were I to venture a conjecture, I ſhould ſay, that in all probability Lamech's polygamy was conſidered as an uſurpation upon

* It is truly ridiculous to hear commentators gravely diſputing about the nature of this ſuppoſed *mark*. Rabbi Jarhi ſays it was one of the letters of God's own name imprinted on his forehead. Another Rabbi fixes on it a horn. Others tell us that a dog (no doubt a black one) went always before him. The generality of Chriſtian interpreters think the *mark* was a univerſal tremor, with a frightful ferocious air. Some indulged him with the ſign of the croſs—and Le Clerc (which is rather aſtoniſhing) makes it only a change of clothes. "Inſigni aliqua veſte tectum incedere jubet *Deus.*"

the right of others, as a ſort of monopoly of the ſex: and that he had been aſſaulted by ſome amorous youth on that account. This may be ſuppoſed to be the young man whom he ſlew in ſelf-defence, and after being ſeverely wounded in the ſtrife. Hence he conſoles his wives, by aſſuring them, that if a ſeven-fold vengeance would have been taken for the murder of his forefather Cain, a ſeventy-ſeven-fold vengeance would be required for the murder of himſelf; who had only ſlain an aggreſſor*.

Ver. 26. *This man aſpired to be called by the name of* אז הוחל לקר אבשם יהוה. After having long meditated on this paſſage I am obliged to ſay, with honeſt Druſius, "Diu me torſit "hic locus, et etiam nunc torquet; video quos fugiam, non video quos ſequar."—I will therefore endeavour, the beſt I can, to juſtify, or defend, my own tranſlation: which is ſupported partly by the Septuagint, and partly by the Vulgate. 1. With the Septuagint and the Vulgate I read זה or וא † inſtead of אז. *This* man; Enos.—2. I read with Sep. יחל for הוחל ‡, or חחל as Sam.—3. I give to יחל the ſame latitude as ελπιζω has in Greek: which ſignifies not merely to *hope*, but to *expect* any thing, good or ill. So the Scholiaſt on Thucydides: το, ΕΛΠΙΣΑΣ, ου μονον επι αγαθον, αλλ' απλως επι τη μελλοντος εκβασει λεγεται. And Homer:

Ου γαρ ὁ γ' αθανατων τα' εελπετο ὁν κατα θυμον
Ελθοντ' η Τρωεσσιν αριηγεμεν, η Δαναοισιν. Il. 13. 8, 9.

This meaning is ſtill more clearly expreſſed in the Arabic under the root חאל; which, with other ſignifications, has that of *expetere, cupere, attentare.* I need not tell the learned reader, that the roots חאל, חול, חלל, and חלה are often confounded in particular tenſes.

This preſuppoſed, I think the Septuagint, properly underſtood, have given the true meaning of the paſſage: Ουτος ηλπισεν επικαλεισθαι το ονομα Κυριε τε Θεου. Επικαλεισθαι το ονομα is pure Attic Greek. Plato ſays, Ονομα δε ὑμνοι επικαλουντο, *They are called by the name of hymns.*

That επικαλεω in the Septuagint ſignifies to *denominate, cognominare,* is clear from Num. 21. 3. επεκαλεσαν το ονομα τε τοπου εκεινε. κ. τ. λ.—And, in the ſame conſtruction as in Gen. Deut. 15. 2. ὁτι επικεκληται αφεσις Κυριε.—A remarkable inſtance occurs, Pſ. 48. (al. 49.) 11. επεκαλεσαντο τα ονοματα αυτων επι των γαιων αυτων: "They call their lands by their own names."—See alſo Jud. 6. 32. 1 Sam. 23. 28. 1 K. 7. 20.

The meaning of the ſentence, then, I take to be this: "Enos § was the firſt man, who pre-"ſumed to claim divine honours;" or, as Dawſon paraphraſes: "was ambitious of being "accounted a god."

* This alleviation of crime is finely expreſſed by Sophocles, by the mouth of Oedipus, Colon. ver. 261.

— — — και τοι πως εγω κακος φυσιν,
Ὁστις παθων μεν αντ' εδρων, ὡς τ' ει φρονων
Επρασσον, ουδ' αν ὡδ' εγιγνομην κακος.

† For I ſuſpect the word was originally written both ways.

‡ Or הוחל may be in the coäctive voice of יחל; *ſpem-facere*, i. e. *ſpem-habere.*

§ I write *Enos*, not *Enoſh*, becauſe I think that אנוס not אנוש was the original name. *Enos* in Chald. ſignifies a domineering, violent, oppreſſor: and there is a veſtige of this meaning in Hebrew, Eſth. 18.—But this epithet is perfectly ſuitable to Enos, in the ſuppoſition that he claimed divine honours. I have no doubt but the Greek αναξ comes from the ſame root, by a common change of σ into ξ: which σ is ſtill retained in the verb ανασσω.

Cyril

Cyril of Alexandria gives another turn to the paſſage, although he underſtands the word ελπισε as I do. According to him, the title *God* was conferred on Enos, on account of his ſuperior ſanctity. Ελπισε τοινυν Ενως κληθησεσθαι, παρ' ετερων, επ' ονοματι Κυριου του Θεου αυτου· τουτ' εϛι Θεος. Επειδαν γαρ ην ουκ αθαυμαϛος τοις της ὁσιοτητος επρεπων αυχημαϛι, θεον ωνομαζον αυτον των επιεικεϛερων ταχα που τινες, τη υπερτατη τιμη στεφανουν ἠρημενοι. Glaph. l. 1. vol. 1. p. 23.

They who are for retaining the preſent Hebrew reading חדל, are generally of opinion, with Le Clerc, that the meaning of the ſentence is: Then Seth's poſterity began to be denominated from God; i. e. they were called God's children; to diſtinguiſh them from the children of men, or Cain's poſterity. But this is aſſerted without proof, or probability. See the Remark on chap. 6. ver. 2.

Others render: "Then men began to call on the name of the Lord God," that is, to invoke and worſhip him—a ſtill leſs probable rendering.

Others: "Then was profaned the name of the Lord God;" i. e. then began idolatry. So moſt of the Jewiſh interpreters as far back as the days of Jerom. "Plerique Hebræorum ar-" bitrantur, quod tunc primum in nomine Domini, et in ſimilitudine ejus, fabricata ſint idola." Q. in Gen.—In fact, Onkelos, the Thargums, Aben-Ezrah, Jarhi, &c. are of that opinion. And ſo Houbigant: "Tum primum cœpere homines Dei nomine appellari."

CHAP. V.

IT is clear that this chapter ſhould begin at ver. 25. of the preceding one; according to the ſectional diviſion which I have made in my verſion; which, I am happy to find, meets with general approbation. There is little more, in it, to remark upon. It contains a genealogy of names from Adam to Noah: and, in this genealogy, there is a difference of 100 years between the Hebrew and Greek chronology, with reſpect to the births; but the ſums total of the ages are the ſame; except in the age of Lamech. There is alſo ſome difference between the Hebrew and Samaritan exemplars; which may be ſeen in the Various Readings. The time to diſcuſs their reſpective credibility is not yet come: the ſubject will make a part of my General Preface.

Ver. 22. *Henoch—lived a godly life.* Literally, *walked with God.* יתהלך את אלהים; which the Greek tranſlator renders ευηρεστησε τῳ Θεῳ. Syr. שפר לאלהא, *was well pleaſing to God.* So, equivalently, both Arabs. Onkelos: *walked in the fear of God.* Vulgate: *ambulavit cum Deo.* Tharg. and Perſ. *did all that the Lord commanded.* The Gr. of Venice, ωεπορευται ξυν τῳ Θεῳ.

It is a pure orientaliſm; and is well explained by Wilkins in his notes upon the *Heetopades.* It is called *taking the ſtaff*; that is, renouncing the cares of the world, and retiring from ſociety into the wilderneſs, to lead the life of a Brahma-Charee; literally, *one who walketh in God.* The ceremonies of taking the ſtaff, he tells us, are fully explained in the 2d chapter of the Laws of Manoo. See his notes 58, 59, and 378.—Hence I now think that in

Ver. 24. where Enoch is ſaid to have *diſappeared*; literally, *was not* איננו; and that *God took him away* כי לקח אתו אלהים; the meaning is not a *tranſlation* from this world to Paradiſe; but either

either ſimply a retirement from ſociety; by which a man is ſaid to be loſt to the world and his friends; or a premature death, that he might not be corrupted by the contagion of the world: as the author of the Book of Wiſdom has beautifully expreſſed it: Becauſe he pleaſed God, and was beloved of him, . . . he was *taken away* μετετεθη . . . that wickedneſs might not alter his underſtanding, nor deceit beguile his ſoul. Wiſd. 4. 10, 11.

The author of the Epiſtle to the Hebrews, indeed, ſays, that Henoch was *tranſlated*, ſo *as not to ſee death*, του μη ιδειν θανατον: and thoſe who deem every ſentence of that epiſtle of divine authority, will, conſequently, reject my explanation: and they are welcome ſo to do. I will only ſay with Druſius, that it cannot be proved from the text of Geneſis, that Henoch died not like other men. "*Ambulavit* (inquit) *cum Deo, et non fuit, quia tulit eum Deus.* Audio, "*non fuiſſe*; non audio, *vivere.* Audio, *ſublatum eſſe*; non audio *vivum eſſe* in paradiſo, aut "in cœlo.—Tolli etiam dicitur, qui mortuus: ut, *tolle animam meam a me*; et, *in medio dierum* "*meorum ne tollas me.*"

CHAP. VI.

Ver. 2. *THE ſons of the gods,* בני האלהים. Another ſtumbling-block to interpreters, which, perhaps, will never be removed.—Who are thoſe *ſons of the gods*; or, as the words will bear to be rendered, *ſons of God?* Joſephus, Philo, and the more early Chriſtian fathers imagined that the *ſons of God* were angels or aërial beings, who, charmed with the beauty of the daughters of men, found means to violate them; from which commerce ſprang a race of lawleſs giants, or heroes, who corrupted the earth.—Although this idea has been exploded by more recent commentators, it is not without plauſibility. I mean, that it is very poſſible that the writer of Geneſis may have had that belief. It ſeems to have been a prevalent opinion among the antient nations, that the gods had occaſionally carnal commerce with the human kind; and that from that commerce the greateſt heroes ſprang. Why may not a ſimilar opinion have prevailed among the Hebrews? That it was common at the commencement of Chriſtianity is clear from Joſephus and Philo; and from the earlieſt Chriſtian writers both Greek and Latin; who read in their copies, or tranſlations, of the Septuagint, αγγελοι, *angeli*, inſtead of υιοι: and ſo read ſtill the Alexandrian, and three other MSS.*; and ſo read the Coptic; and even the Perſic verſion, although not made from the Septuagint.

But it is abſurd to imagine that the angels had commerce with women. True: but how many abſurdities were believed, and are yet believed, by many Jews and many Chriſtians? The queſtion is not, whether it were an abſurd, but whether it were a common belief? And of this, I preſume, there is no doubt. The writer of Geneſis, then, might believe, that the *angels*, called *the ſons, of God*, were the fathers of thoſe giants, or heroes, who corrupted the world by their violences and atrocities; which were ultimately the cauſe of the deluge.

Let us next ſee what meaning thoſe who object to the abſurdity of the former opinion, would give to the words; and what hypotheſis they would ſubſtitute in the room of the more

* See Dr. Holmes's various readings on Geneſis, juſt now publiſhed.

antient

antient one. They tell us, that the ſons of God were the poſterity of holy Seth, and the daughters of men the poſterity of wicked Cain: and that thoſe aſſociating with theſe produced a race of monſters, called giants; who corrupted the whole earth.—One would expect ſuch conſequences rather from the wicked ſons of Cain aſſociating with the pious daughters of Seth; or, to preſerve the Hebrew phraſeology, from *the ſons of men* violating *the daughters of God*. This would be much more natural, than making *the ſons of God* violate *the daughters of men*. From the lawleſs poſterity of wicked Cain this might be expected: but who would expect it from the godly poſterity of Seth?

Beſides, where is it ſaid, and whence is it learned, that the poſterity of Cain were excluſively wicked, or that of Seth excluſively pious? This is taken for granted, without the ſhadow of a proof. On the contrary, if the explication which I have given of chap. 4. ver. 26. be admitted, the poſterity of Seth began to be impious in its firſt generation, in the perſon of Seth's ſon Enos.—But not to lay any ſtreſs on this, I again aſk, Whence is it known that Cain's poſterity were more wicked than that of Seth? And until this be proved, or made probable, I muſt reject this interpretation of the paſſage; as more exceptionable even than that of the antients.

Remains only one ſolution of the difficulty; and that is, to render אלהים in the plural, to tranſlate *ſons of the gods*, and to take theſe for the *great* ones of the earth, who, like Enos, aſſumed ſuperiour power and domineered over the *little* ones. Theſe pretended demi-gods ſeized at pleaſure the daughters of the plebeians, or inferior men, without law or juſtice; and their ſpurious brood became ſtill more lawleſs than their fathers. They were all ſo many Robin Hoods, who lived as free-booters in the foreſts, and fell upon the unwary travellers, and ſpoiled them. See the Remark on ver. 4.

This is no new idea. Aquila, although a cloſe and verbal tranſlator, rendered οἱ υἱοι των θεων; and Symmachus υἱοι των δυναϛευοντων: and to the ſame purport all the oriental verſions except the Perſic; which has פרשתכאן *pheriſhthechan* angels, and the Syriac, which retains the Hebrew words בני אלהים, and conſequently may have the ſame meaning. The reſt all favour Aquila's, and my tranſlation. Onk. and the Thargums, בני רהרביא *the ſons of the great*. Sam. verſion, ברי שלטניה *the ſons of ſultans*; and both Arabs, *the ſons of the nobles* בנו אלאשראף, or אולאד אלאשראף.

It being certain, then, that the word אלהים is, in the Hebrew idiom, applicable to great, powerful men, in contradiſtinction to the vulgar; בני האלהים may fairly be rendered *the ſons of the gods*; that is, of great and powerful perſonages; and ſo contraſted with *the daughters of men*, that is, common plebeian men.—This granted, I ſee no medium, in explaining the paſſage before us, but either to adopt the laſt interpretation, or return to the firſt; notwithſtanding its abſurdity.

Ver. 3. *I will never*, &c. The Hebrew words are לא ידון רוחי באדם לעולם בשגם הוא בשר; which the firſt Greek tranſlators render thus, Ου μη καταμεινη το πνευμα μου εν τοις ανθρωποις τϛτοις εις τον αιωνα, δια το ειναι αυτους σαρκας. Vulg. *Non permanebit ſpiritus meus in homine, in æternum, quia caro eſt*. And ſo equivalently Syr. Onk. Arab. "My ſpirit ſhall not abide, "or dwell, in man for ever; becauſe he is fleſh, or fleſhly." Thoſe antient interpreters are ſuppoſed by modern critics to have read ילון, or ידם, or ידור, inſtead of ידון, which is the reading

ing of the preſent text, in both Heb. and Sam. copies; without any material variety of lection*. It was undoubtedly the reading of Symmachus's copy: for he renders it by κρινει; and of that of Jerom, who in his Hebr. Queſt. expreſsly ſays: "In Hebræo ſcriptum eſt: *non judicabit* "*ſpiritus meus*," &c.—Were I to adopt the Greek rendering of the Septuagint, I would ſay that they took ידון, or ידן, for the future of נדן; which, from the noun נֶדֶן, we may ſuppoſe to have ſignified *to enſheathe*: as if God had ſaid: "My ſpirit ſhall not for ever be enſheathed "in man:" that is, The vital breath, with which I inſpired him, ſhall not for ever, *or rather* for a long time, animate its ſheath of clay: 120 years only ſhall be allowed him.—This would appear to be the meaning of the Greek tranſlators: and this acceptation of the word ידון was adopted by our firſt modern tranſlator Pagninus, who renders "non erit in vagina." He borrowed the idea from R. I. Kimhi: but few, I believe, beſide Cajetan and Mariana, have, in this, followed him. The generality of interpreters have, with Munſter and Luther, given to דון the meaning of *rixari, contendere, diſceptare*: and ſo our vulgar verſion: "My ſpirit ſhall "not always ſtrive with man." So, alſo, Michaëlis: "Mein geiſt ſoll die menſchen nicht "immerfort ſtrafen."—Singular, I think, is the verſion of Roſenmüller†: "Non *contemnetur* "ſpiritus meus inter homines." This tranſlation he grounds on an Arabic ſignification of דן, which denotes *inferiority, vileneſs, contempt*. "Ita ut ſignificatione *vilis, contemptus fuit* in "verbum Hebraicum tranſlata, totius commatis ſenſus hic ſit: *Non feram, ut ſpiritus meus, per* "*prophetas admonens homines, ab his in perpetuum contemnatur: puniam: mortales ſunt: omnes* "*poſt centum et viginti annos interibunt.*"

Having thus fairly given the tranſlations of others, I now venture to ſupport my own.—The whole difficulty lies in the two words ידון and בשגם. Let me endeavour to fix their meaning.

The verb דון, before a perſon without a præfix, generally means *to do juſtice* to that perſon; and, in the coäctive voice, *to avenge* that perſon, or *cauſe him to be righted*. Thus Gen. 30. 6. "God hath *righted me*," דנני. And Deut. 32. 36. "The Lord *will avenge* his people" ידין יהוה עמו. See alſo Gen. 49. 16. Pſ. 50. 4.—54. 3.—72. 2.—But when דון is followed by a perſon, or perſons, with the præfix ב, then it ſignifies *to execute juſtice on*, i. e. *to puniſh*. So Pſ. 110. 6. "He will execute juſtice on the nations" ידין בגוים: and ſo here ידון באדם muſt be rendered, *to execute juſtice on mankind*; *to puniſh mankind*. Theſe are the only meanings of the verb דון; nor can a ſingle example be brought to ſhew that, either in its active or coäctive voice, it ever ſignifies *rixari, contendere, diſceptare*; *to ſtrive*. It is true, that מדון ſometimes, and מדנים frequently ſignify *contentions*‡; but דון never to *contend*.—I have, therefore, no heſitation in rendering the firſt part of the paſſage literally: My ſpirit "ſhall not execute, or pronounce, "judgment againſt man:" and as רוחי is allowed by the beſt critics to be the ſame with אני or אנוכי, I have put in my verſion "I will not... pronounce judgment," &c.—The word בשגם is next to be conſidered. It has been commonly ſuppoſed to be a compound of the præfix ב, the pronoun ש for אשר, and the indeclinable particle גם; and rendered *eo quod etiam, propterea*

* One MS. has ידן, and one ירון. This latter is evidently an errour of the tranſcriber.

† Unleſs, perhaps, the Erpenian Arab have ſome ſuch meaning.

‡ For a plain reaſon, becauſe they are often brought before the judge: as is implied by the præfix *mem*.

quod,

quod, becauſe; or, as our Engliſh tranſlators render, *for that alſo.*—I cannot acquieſce in this derivation, becauſe I find nowhere elſe ſuch a compound in the whole Pentateuch; nor indeed in any hiſtorical book of the Old Teſtament. I find שגם in the book of Eccleſiaſtes for אשר גם; but no where בשגם * for באשר גם. Nay, I do not believe that the earlieſt Hebrew writers ever uſed ש for אשר, in proſe at leaſt: and the firſt inſtance in poetry, which I at preſent recollect, is in the ſong of Debora, Jud. 5. 7.

It was this conſideration, probably, that led Guſſet, Michaëlis and Dathe to make שג the infinitive of שגג *errare*; and render *propter errores eorum*; Michaël. *wen ſie irren.*

I, likewiſe, take שגג or שגה to be the root of the word: but I give it a ſomewhat different meaning; a meaning which I think inherent in the verb; and which ſets the mercy and long ſuffering of God in a fairer point of view: "I will never *at unawares* † pronounce (or exe-" cute) judgment on mankind." They ſhall not be puniſhed unwarned—בשגם *in ignorantia eorum.* They are but frail fleſh; and ſhall have yet 120 years given them to repent and amend their lives. Such, I think, is the meaning of the Text; which I thus point: לא ידון רוחי באדם׳ לעולם׳ בשגם· הוא בשר—Let others judge for themſelves.

Ver. 4. *In thoſe days were giants*, or rather *the giants* הנפלים. The word is variouſly rendered by the antient tranſlators. Sep. and Gr. Ven. γιγαντες, Vulg. *gigantes.* But Aquila has επιπιπτοντες, Sym. οἱ βιαιοι, Syr. ננברא, Onk. גבריא, Arab. גבאברה, Perſ. ﻫﺎﻧﺎﻥ; all which denote *great, powerful, violent* men.—The Hebrew word may be derived either from נפל or פלה. The former has generally been conſidered as the root; and הנפלים made to ſignify *the fallers-on:* equivalent to the επιπιπτοντες of Aquila; as if they *fell upon* the weak and unwary, and killed or ſpoiled them ‡. Dathe tranſlates it *latrones*; which is approved by Roſenmüller: "Non enim neceſſe eſt (ſays he) genus quoddam ſingulare hominum, altiori quam ſolita ſta-" tura, intelligere, uti multi antiquorum interpretum fecerunt. Quum enim נפל *incidere, ir-" ruere* denotet, נפלים erunt *irruentes*; i. e. *prædones, latrones*, qui fortaſſe equis latrocinia exer-" cebant; ut Arabum hodie multi: ex quo genere etiam centauri Græcorum fuerunt."—This is certainly ingenious: yet, I think the other etymon preferable; according to which הנפלים will ſignify *the diſtinguiſhed*, men who *ſeparated* themſelves from the multitude, and eſtabliſhed themſelves into a higher, domineering caſt: hence they are, juſt after, called אנשי השם *men of name*, "the famed heroes of antiquity."

Ver. 13. *The abomination of all fleſh*, &c. קץ כל בשר. I derive קץ from קוץ, not from קצץ; becauſe I think, that "The end of all fleſh is come before me" is not an Hebraiſm. Something ſimilar, indeed, occurs Jerem. 51. 13. בא קצך *Thine end is come*, or *coming*; and in ſome other places the ſame mode of expreſſion is found: but this, in my apprehenſion, is different from the preſent conſtruction of בא. Here לפני ſeems equivalent to אלי Gen. 18. 21. "Ac-" cording to the report that *hath come to me*;" and Exod. 3. 9. "The cry of the children " of Iſrael *hath reached me*;" באה אלי. So Jonah 2. 7. תבוא אליך תפלתי "My prayer *came* " *to thee.*"—In ſhort, בא followed by לפני, לפניך, לפניו, &c. to me appears to ſignify, not the

* The compoſition moſt analogous to it is בשכבו in Eccleſ. 2. 16.

† Our Engliſh tranſlators have uſed the ſame term, Num. 35. 11, 15. and Joſh. 20. 9.

‡ So Jerom in Q. Hebr. *Cadentes erant in terra.*

arrival of any period; but *the coming* of ſomething into one's *preſence*.—This, however, I give only as a probable opinion; and not without ſome little doubt and heſitation.

Ver. 14. *An ark.* I have noticed in my explanatory note, that *ſhip* perhaps would be a better rendering. The Hebr. word is תבת (ſix MSS. have תיבת) *thebath* or *thibath*, the conſtructive form of תבה which is evidently the Greek θηκη; and ſo the Septuagint render the word Exod. 2. 3. where only it again occurs. Here they render it κιβωτον *, Joſephus λαρναξα, Vulg. *arcam*, Syr. קאבותא, Onk. and Tharg. תיבותא, Arab. Poll. תאבותא, Arab. Erp. תאבותה†, Perſ. כשתי, *cheſti*, i. e. *a ſhip*. And ſo the Sam. verſion ספינה.

That the *ark* of Noah anſwered, in ſome ſenſe, the purpoſe of a *ſhip* is clear: but it is not ſo certain that it was of the ſame form and ſhape. The argument uſed by Michaëlis, Dathe and Roſenmüller is, in my opinion, not concluſive. "The word תבה, ſay they, is badly rendered "by the word *ark*: for the form of an ark is altogether unfit for the purpoſe to which the "veſſel of Noah was deſtined. It muſt have had the roundiſh form of a *ſhip*; otherwiſe it "could not have reſiſted the force of the waves."—But whence is deduced the neceſſity of its reſiſting the force of the waves? It was not intended to be conducted like a ſhip from any determined place to another; but merely "to float on the ſurface of the waters." See ch. 7. 17. It appears to have had neither helm, nor maſt, nor oars: but was a bulky capacious veſſel, light enough to be raiſed aloft, with all its contents, by the gradual riſe of the deluge. It was therefore of little importance of what ſhape it was: and it might be as well of the form of an ark as of any other. The ark, in which Moſes was expoſed, was a veſſel of the ſame nature, and bears the ſame name; and ſome have thought that both were made of the ſame materials; as we ſhall ſee in the next Remark. With reſpect to the etymology of the Hebrew word, the moſt rational ſeems to be that of Clodius, who derives it from the Arab. תאב *collegit*; "ex "quo, ſays he, תבה, or תיבה, locum ſignificat in quem res colligantur."—Forſter derives it from two Egyptian words, *thoi* a *ſhip*, and *bai* a *palm-tree branch*. Such ſhips are ſtill to be ſeen not only in Egypt, but in India and other countries; particularly in ſome iſles in the Pacific Ocean. See Forſter De byſſo antiquorum.

Ib. *Gopher-wood.* עצי גפר. We are here again puzzled by the variety of interpretation. What is Gopher-wood?—The Septuagint have ξυλων τετραγωνων‡ *ſquare boards*; Vulg. *lignis lævigatis*, ſmoothed boards. Onk. קדרום § *cedar*. Syr. ערקא, which, in the Polyglott, is rendered *vimen*; but which Caſtellus takes for the *juniper*; which in Syria grows to ſuch a ſize, as that boards twenty feet long may be made of it. Both Arabs have שמשאר rendered by ſome *box-wood*, by others the *juniper*, and by others the *cypreſs*. Perſ. ענבר the *pine*. All, apparently, ſo many pure conjectures; and none of which have any literal ſimilarity to the Hebrew term, except the *cypreſs*, κυπαρισσος; of which the five firſt letters have a reſemblance to גפר. Hence

* So alſo Gr. Ven.

† All theſe are equivalent to κιβωτος, or θικη. The Coptic tranſlator retained the Greek word with the Coptic article.

‡ In the Rom. edition, and in Holmes's Collations, are three other readings; which Montfaucon ſuppoſes to be thoſe of Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion: namely, κεδρινων, ασηπτων and πυξινων: but the ſecond of theſe is found in ſix MSS. of Sep. and was read by Chryſoſtom.

§ So alſo the Thargums, and the Gr. of Venice.

moſt

moſt modern interpreters, with Celſius, will have it to be the *cypreſs*; becauſe that tree abounds in Syria, Phœnicia, and Aſſyria: and a great quantity of *Gopher*-wood muſt have been needed for ſo large a veſſel as Noah's ark. On the other ſide, Michaëlis, for that very reaſon, objects to the *cypreſs*. "Si enim ejuſmodi arbor Hebræis, Aramæis, Arabibus domeſtica fuiſſet, nomen "ejus ſæpius in Cod. Hebræo, et in aliis libris orientalibus occurrere deberet. Sed quum "neutrum horum ſit, colligi poteſt, hanc arborem in regionibus ſupra memoratis plane non "creſcere." I cannot deem this a ſtrong objection: for, under what other name does this tree, ſo abundant in the country, appear to be more frequently mentioned in the Hebrew ſcripture? Or, rather, what is the real Hebrew name for the *cypreſs-tree?* The moſt antient Greek tranſlators make it ſometimes the ארז, ſometimes the ברוש, and ſometimes the ברות. So uncertain were they about its real Hebrew denomination. Our laſt Engliſh tranſlators found it but once, I think, in the whole Hebrew Bible, and that in the word תרזה, Iſ. 44. 14. which, in Lowth's tranſlation, is the *pine*. In truth, the particular ſpecies of trees, herbs, ſtones, metals and animals, mentioned in the Hebrew writings, are now little known: and nothing but a long reſidence in the oriental regions, a thorough acquaintance with the various vulgar dialects, and a deep philoſophical reſearch into the mineral, vegetable and animal kingdoms, can ever throw more light, than we have, on this ſubject.

Bochart waſted his great learning to ſhew, that גפר is the *ebony-tree:* but this, certainly, of all woods, is the moſt unfit for the purpoſe.

Michaëlis would derive the word from the Arabic גפר *adolevit*; and render *full grown trees*, "groſſe vollkommen aufgewachſene bäume."

Delgado, a learned London Jew, who has given ſome good obſervations on the Pentateuch, tranſlates *pitched planks*; with this remark: "Gopher-wood is wrong: for עצי is in the "plural number, and means rather *planks* or *boards*; and גפר is derived from גפרית, which is "a ſort of bitumen, or pitch; and I take it to be the ſame as כפר: for the כ and ג are often "put in Hebrew indifferently; as we find יסכרו and יסגרו to have the ſame meaning." The remark is ingenious; but it is not new: for St. Jerom thought the Hebrew word had that ſignification. "Pro *quadratis* lignis (ſays he) *bituminata* legimus in Hebræo." Queſt. Hebr. in Gen. Did he read כפר, or did he, with Delgado, take it and גפר to be the ſame?—However that be, I cannot allow that עצי גפר can mean *pitched planks*; for two reaſons. 1. Becauſe, in that caſe, there would be a tautology in the text: for what need to tell us afterward that the ark was *pitched*, if it were told to us before that it was made of *pitched planks?* 2dly, Suppoſing that גפר means *pitch* or *bitumen*, עצי גפר could not ſignify *pitched planks*; but either *trees producing pitch*, or *planks made of ſuch trees*. The word עצי being in the plural number is no ſufficient cauſe for not rendering it *wood:* for ſo it is elſewhere rendered, even in the Pentateuch, without being objected to by Delgado. So *Setim-wood* עצי שטים, Exod. 25. 10. and often in the ſame and following chapters.

Theſe are the various interpretations which I have met with, or at preſent recollect, of the word גפר, or rather גופר, for ſo I think it was originally written. Others may have conjectured otherwiſe: ſo, ſince we muſt be contented with conjectures, let me conjecture alſo.—My conjecture then is, That the Syriac tranſlator has given the true meaning in the word ערקא; and that this word has been well rendered by the Latin word *vimen*. Let us try to fix

the meaning of both.—The latter ſignifies in general a *twig*, *rod*, *wicker* of any kind; and is equivalent to the Greek λυγος, ῥιψ, οισυα. Now that the Syr. word ערקא has the ſame meaning, appears to me moſt probable from its certainly ſignifying a *tie*, *ligament*, *belt*, &c. which I doubt not were all originally made of ſlender *twigs* or *withes*. In Arabic the ſame word ſignifies a cheſt, coffer or baſket made of twigs, particularly of palm-tree leaves. And, indeed, all the firſt veſſels of capacity, whether coffer, ark, or ſhip, ſeem to have been compoſed of the ſame materials. The ſhip or ark of Noah, then, if ever ſuch an ark exiſted, was, in my apprehenſion, a large coffer formed of twigs, like baſket-work, and covered over with bitumen, both within and without, to keep out the water. Whether thoſe twigs were of oſier, or palm-tree, or hazel, or poplar, or birch, or juniper *, or any other kind of vimineous wood, I would not raſhly ſay: but I think it muſt have been the oſier; which, as we learn from Columella, was conſidered as the principal of the wicker kind. "Vimina fiunt ex populorum virgis, ulmi, "et ſanguineorum fruticum, et betulæ, et coryli intortæ, et *ſalicis*, quæ principatum obtinent." Certain we are that boats, barks and ſhips were originally made of ſuch twigs, and particularly of *oſier*. Thoſe even, which were externally covered with ſkins, had their ribs at leaſt of that wood; no doubt, on account of its pliability. See Herodotus, Clio; and Niebuhr *Voyage de l'Arabie*, vol. ii. p. 175.

It has been already remarked, that the Syriac verſion has a word denoting wicker-wood, ערקא, *arka*, or *orka* †. The Sam. ver. has a word, which has probably the ſame meaning, סיסם; which in an Arabic verſion, made from the Sam. is rendered סאג ‡. I know that this word is thought to be by ſome the *pine*, by others the *juniper*, by others the *box-tree*, and by Bochart the *ebony*: but I am perſuaded that it is either the willow, or ſome ſpecies of wood of the wattling kind, fit for making wicker-works, ſuch as hedges, coffers, baſkets, arks, &c. We find ſeveral analogous terms in the Chaldee and Arabic. In the former סיג and סיגא ſignify a *hedge*; in the latter סוג is a large *corn* or *bread-baſket*; סיאג is a *hedge*, and סאגי any *reed*, *twig*, or *rod*, fit for making a hedge.

It is further remarkable, that the word *karbh* (which is only the Hebrew גפר, with a common tranſpoſition of letters) ſignifies in the Erſe, or Scoto-Celtic dialect, both a *ſhip* and a *baſket*; and that among the various names of a *ſhip*, among the Scytho-Scandinavians, the firſt mentioned by Verelius is *karphi*. See Vallancey's Collectanea, No. 14. Introd. p. 33.—Add that קפיר in Arabic ſignifies a *baſket* or *coffer*: and I have no doubt, that this laſt word, as well as the Greek κοφινος, is derived from the ſame origin.

I could ſupport this ſignification of the word גפר by many other probable collateral arguments: but I fear I have already more than ſufficiently *Bochartized*: ſo I return to my text.

Ib. *Full of cells thou ſhalt make the ark.* קנים תעשה את התבה. Lit. "Neſts thou ſhalt make "the ark:" that is, thou ſhalt divide it into a number of proper receptacles for the animals, and other things to be contained in it.—The ingenious Abraham Dawſon, however, gives

* Which is often uſed in wattling, even in this iſland.

† May not this be the very *arca* of the Latins, and our *ark*? a more probable etymon, ſurely, than that which derives it from ειργω.

‡ By the Thalmudiſts called סאגא.—The original word itſelf is ſtill in uſe in the Scoto-Saxon dialect, *ſaugh*, (pron. σαχ) and is the general name for the *willow*.

another

another turn to the paſſage, and renders thus: "Make thee an ark of bulruſhes: of reeds "קנים thou ſhalt make the ark." He ſuppoſes that the original reading was not עצי גפר, but עצי גמא, as in Exod. 2. 3., and he makes קנים the plural of קָנָה a *reed*, and not of קֵן a *neſt*.—I ſee no good reaſon, either for changing the reading of the Text, or the etymon of קנים; which ſignify not only *neſts*, but any ſmall *manſions*, *cells*, *lodgements*, *conclaves*, &c.: juſt ſuch as the various apartments in the ark of Noah muſt have been.

Ib. *With bitumen thou ſhalt pitch it over.* כפרת אתה בכפר Lit. "Thou ſhalt coat it with "a coating:" but as that *coating* or *covering* was moſt probably *bitumen*; I have followed the Sep. and Vulg.: who render, the former *ασφαλτωσεις αυτην τῃ ασφαλτῳ* *; the latter, *bitumine linies*.—Moſt of the other antient verſions either retain the Hebrew word, as Syr. Onk. and Arab. Pol. or uſe a term that may denote *bitumen* as well as any other pitchy ſubſtance. Thus Arab. Erp. באלזפת, Sam. Ver. בקלפון †, Perſ. דר־קיל; if קיל be not a typographical error, for קיר.—The Thargums only, more explicitly, call it *bitumen*, בחימרא; as the Gr. of Ven. is more explicit for *pitch*, *πιττωσεις τ' αυτην εν πιττῃ*.—This laſt term has been preferred by our Engliſh, and moſt other modern, tranſlators; although their *anteſignanus* Sanctes Pagninus led them a different road: for he has *bituminabis eam bitumine:* which Arias Montanus retained; and which Le Clerc, Houbigant, Dathe, and Roſenmüller have equipollently adopted.—*Bitumine illinies—bitumine obducito—bitumine obduc* ‡.

The *bitumen Judaicum*, or *aſphaltus*, was the moſt proper of all ſubſtances for pitching over the ark of Noah. At firſt, ſoft, viſcous, and pliable, it might be thruſt into every chaſm and crevice with the greateſt eaſe: but it would ſoon acquire a tenacity and hardneſs ſuperiour to thoſe of our pitch. A coat of it, ſpread over both the inſide § and the outſide of an ark of wicker-work, would make it perfectly water-proof and impenetrable: and the longer it was kept in the water, the harder and ſtronger it would grow. The Arabs ſtill uſe it for careening their veſſels: and, mixt with a tenth part of common pitch, it has been employed to the ſame purpoſe in our days, by Mr. De la Sabloniere, at L'Orient. This mixture is called *piſſaſphaltus*.

Ver. 15. *Three hundred cubits*, &c. The dimenſions of the ark of Noah ‖ have been objected to as wholly inadequate: and indeed if ſo many pairs of all the beaſts and birds now known entered into it with proviſions for a whole year, we muſt allow that the objection is well founded. It was made by Apelles, one of Marcion's diſciples, and by Celſus: and was anſwered by Origen in a very ſingular manner. He learned, it ſeems, from ſome Hebrew rabbins, that the dimenſions of Moſes are to be conſidered according to a certain geometrical power, by which the real extent of the ark becomes ninety thouſand cubits long, and two

* So likewiſe Aquila, *αλοιφησης αλοιφῃ*.

† This ſeems, like the Hebrew word, to be a generical term: from which is, moſt probably, derived the Spaniſh *calfatear* and the French *calfeutrer*. See the next note.

‡ In the new reviſal of the French Geneva verſion, which was made, I think, about the middle of this century, we have a ſimilar rendering: "Tu la calfeutreras de bitume."—And La Cene: "Vous le goudronnerez de bitume."

§ This circumſtance, too, ſeems ſtrongly to make for a veſſel of wicker work. If it had been conſtructed of planks, like our ſhips, there would have been no need for an inner coating.

‖ The ark of Xiſuthrus, the Noah of Beroſus, was much larger: its length was five furlongs; and two furlongs its breadth.—The Hebrew hiſtorian moſt probably proportioned *his* ark according to his own ſcanty knowledge of natural hiſtory, and the number of beaſts and birds with which he was acquainted.

thouſand

thouſand and five hundred cubits broad! τῳ δυναμει λεγεσθαι τα μετρα· ὡς εννεα μεν ειναι μυριαδων το μηκος κατα την βασιν, κατα δε το πλατος δισχιλιων πεντακοσιων *.—If Apelles and Celſus were ſatiſfied with ſuch an anſwer, they were not hard to pleaſe. Our modern commentators ſtick to the ſimple dimenſions as they are; and labour to demonſtrate that there was room enough. The reader, if he chooſe, may ſee the ſum of what they have ſaid in Calmet's Dictionary.—For my part, I freely confeſs, that their pretended demonſtrations tend only to make me more ſceptical—but I leave the ſubject to mathematical divines, and proceed in my critical career.

Ver. 16. *A ſloping deck.* צהר. This word has been generally rendered a *window*, or *light*; very improperly in my opinion; although countenanced by the Vulgate, and moſt other antient verſions. The Hebrew word for a window is חלון, not צהר; nor has this latter the ſignification of *window* in any kindred dialect. In Arabic it denotes a *ridge*, *culmen*; and here it, apparently, means a gradual culmination of the deck of the ark. The Septuagint ſeem to have well underſtood the meaning; although they have not perfectly expreſſed it. Their verſion, in the preſent copies, is επισυναγων ποιησεις την κιβωτον, *colligens facies arcam:* but one of Holmes's MSS. has, in the margin, επι συναγωγην; which, I am much inclined to believe, is the true reading. At leaſt it is more grammatical than the other, and better expreſſes what I take to be the real meaning of the author. The ark was gradually contracted at the top, in the form of a ſloping roof; and the middle of that roof roſe a whole cubit higher than its extremities: and this ſlope, as I have remarked in my explanatory note, was ſufficient, when covered with bitumen, to let the water paſs eaſily off the deck. See Buteo's Diſſertation on the Ark, at the end of the ſecond vol. of the Sacred Critics, Roſenmüller's Scholia, and Dathe's note on the place.

Ver. 17. *A deluge of waters.* Lit. *the deluge of waters.* But the Hebrew definite article is often to be expreſſed in Engliſh by the indefinite. Inſtead of *waters* מַיִם *Michaëlis* would read מִיָּם *from the ſea.* For it is not probable, ſays he, that even a forty days rain would have produced ſuch a deluge, unleſs the water had at the ſame time iſſued from the ocean. Certainly it is not probable: nor does the hiſtorian ſay ſo. He tells us that "the fountains of the "great deep were broken up," chap. 7. ver. 11. and the waters that came from thoſe fountains were as truly waters, as thoſe that fell from the heavens. I ſee no neceſſity, then, to change the preſent punctuation: although Schulze has adopted Michaëlis's correction. Dathe has well rendered the Hebrew, "Etenim ego aquarum inundationem terræ immittam."

CHAP. VII.

Ver. 3. THE two additions which I have here inſerted, on the authority of Sam. Sep. and Syr. are conſidered by Michaëlis, Roſenmüller, and others, as interpolations. I, on the contrary, conſider them as eſſential parts of the original Text; which is evidently lame and mutilated without them; as it is, indeed, in many many other places. One cannot help ſmiling at Roſenmüller's way of reaſoning: "Non opus eſt hoc additamento, quum jam per ſe ipſum in-"telligatur neceſſe fuiſſe ut utriuſque generis aves et mundæ et immundæ ſervarentur."—By the ſame mode of arguing, the laſt colon of ver. 2. is equally ſuperfluous: and I doubt not,

* Contr. Celſ. l. 4. No. 41. See alſo Hom. 2. in Geneſim, vol. 2. p. 62.

but

but that if it were wanting in the Hebrew, although found in the Samaritan Text, it would alſo be, by thoſe gentlemen, denominated an uſeleſs interpolation. But I appeal to the common ſenſe of every unbiaſſed plain reader, and aſk him, if he expect not the ſame manner of narrating in the 3d verſe, as he finds in the ſecond? or if he ſee any thing ſuperfluous in the 3d verſe, as it ſtands in my tranſlation?

Ver. 11. *The fountains of the great deep*, &c. By this mean, the whole face of the earth was, according to our hiſtorian, reduced to the ſame ſtate as it was before the ſix days creation. See what has been ſaid on chap. 2. ver. 6.

Ib. *The flood-gates of the heavens.* Although this may only imply a great and copious rain; may not *typhons*, or water-ſpouts, be more particularly deſigned? They are not unuſual on the coaſts of Syria; and are more frequent at the equinoxes, and in a tempeſtuous ſky.

Ver. 20. *Fifteen cubits higher*, &c. This has been always accounted one of the moſt unaccountable phænomena of the deluge; and has, more than any other circumſtance attending it, perplexed and puzzled commentators. The moſt ingenious ſolution of the difficulty which I have met with, is one ſent to me, ſome years ago, by Sir Henry Englefield; which I ſhall here give in his own words: "The diameter of the earth being taken at 8000 miles; and the higheſt "mountain being ſuppoſed four miles high above the level of the ſea *, the quantity of water "requiſite to cover them will be an hollow ſphere of 8008 miles diameter, and four miles "thick; the content of which, in round numbers, is 800,000,000 cubic miles.—Let us now "ſuppoſe the globe of the earth to conſiſt of a cruſt of ſolid matter, 1000 miles thick, en"cloſing a ſea or body of water 2000 miles deep; within which is a central nucleus of 2000 "miles in diameter: the content of that body of water will be 109,200,000,000 cubic miles; "or about 137 times the quantity of water required to cover the ſurface of the earth as above "ſtated. Now water, by experiment, expands about one 25th of its whole magnitude, from "freezing to boiling; or one hundredth of its magnitude for 45 degrees of Fahrenheit's ther"mometer. Suppoſe, then, that the heat of the globe, previouſly to the deluge, was about "50 degrees of Fahrenheit's, a temperature very near that of this climate; and that a ſudden "change took place in the interiour of the globe, which raiſed its heat to 83 degrees; an heat "no greater than the marine animals live in, in the ſhallow ſeas between the tropics; thoſe "23 degrees of augmented heat would ſo expand the internal ſea, as to cauſe it to more than "cover the ſurface of the globe, according to the conditions abovementioned: and if the cauſe "of heat ceaſed, the waters would of courſe, in cooling, retire into their former places.—If "the central nucleus be ſuppoſed 3000 miles, and the internal ſea only 1500 miles deep, its "content will then be 99,200,000,000 cubic miles, or 125 times the water required: and, in "that caſe, an additional heat of 36 degrees to the previous temperature of the earth will be "ſufficient to produce the above deſcribed effect.—It is ſcarce neceſſary to ſay, that the per"fect regularity here ſuppoſed to exiſt in the form of the interiour parts of the globe, is of no "conſequence to the propoſed hypotheſis; which will be equally juſt, if the above given quan"tity of waters be any how diſpoſed within the earth.—Neither is it here propoſed to diſcuſs "the reality of a central fire, which many philoſophers maintain, and many deny.—It may not

* This is more than the height of the Andes.

"be

" be unworthy to remark, that the above hypotheſis, which does not in any way contradict " any law of nature, does ſingularly accord with the Moſaic narrative of the deluge: for the " ſudden expanſion of the internal waters would, of courſe, force them up through the chaſms " of the exteriour cruſt in dreadful jets and torrents; while their heat would cauſe ſuch " vapours to aſcend into the atmoſphere, as, when condenſed, would produce torrents of rain " beyond our conception."

The poſſibility of a univerſal deluge, then; of a deluge riſing *fifteen cubits above the higheſt mountains**, can hardly be denied: but whether ſuch a deluge ever happened is another queſtion. Certain it is, that the belief of a general deluge prevailed among moſt antient nations: but local and partial exundations may have given riſe to this belief. The daughters of Lot imagined that all mankind were enveloped in the deſtruction of Sodom. A traditional tale is eaſily exaggerated and improved upon, by credulous poſterity; and the firſt *writer* gives it with all the accumulated circumſtances. What reaſon have we to think, that the Hebrew hiſtorian was exempt from the common lot? All we can ſay is, that he has better told his tale: and this, I preſume, will not be denied by the greateſt ſceptic; who has compared it with the ſimilar ſtories of the Chaldee, Phœnician, Egyptian, Indian, and Greek mythologiſts.—After all he will be apt to ſay, with honeſt Abraham Dawſon, that " the whole hiſtory of the deluge, " conſidered as a literal, hiſtorical narration of facts, is encumbered with great and numerous " difficulties: nor doth it ſeem poſſible to account for it without *miracle* upon *miracle*."—To this I freely ſubſcribe; and think that the inference to be drawn is: That a good deal of the fabulous is mixt with the hiſtory of Noah's flood.—The reader, however, may, if he pleaſe, conſult Le Clerc, Calmet, Jeruſalem, Michaëlis, Dathe—who have all treated on the ſubject with acuteneſs and ingenuity.—See alſo the 1ſt vol. of Univerſal Hiſtory.

CHAP. VIII.

Ver. 4. *THE ſeventeenth day.*—Sep. and Vulg. have *twenty-ſeventh day:* which Houbigant badly defends. It is, indeed, incompatible with the 11th and 24th verſes of laſt chapter; as Maſius moſt juſtly remarks.

Ver. 7. *Did not return.* The preſent Text has יצא ושוב †; which is commonly rendered *exibat, exiens et rediens*; or, as our common Engliſh, " went forth, to and fro."—With Capellus and Houbigant, I prefer the reading of Sep. Syr. and Vulg. who are ſuppoſed by Bochart to have read in their Hebrew copies יצא ולוא ישב; that is, ולוא inſtead of יצוא, *ſcriptione ſatis ſimili*, ſays Houbigant. In this I cannot agree with him: there is very little ſimilarity between יצוא and ולוא, either in the Heb. or Sam. characters. I rather think that the Greek tranſlators read all that is in the preſent Text, although they did not literally render it; and that they read ולוא or ולא beſides, after יצוא. The Syriac tranſlator muſt have read both יצא and יצוא in his

* It is not at all neceſſary to ſuppoſe, with Sir Henry, that the antediluvian mountains were as high as thoſe of the preſent earth. They may have been of a very different form and ſize, and compoſed of other materials.

† Sam. and 24 MSS. have יצא inſtead of יצוא; and 5 MSS. with Sam. have ושב inſtead of ישוב. This is of little moment.

Hebrew

Hebrew copy, as he renders them both, נפק מפק *exiit exiens:* but he muſt alſo have read ולוא after thoſe words, as he adds ולא הפך, *et non reverſus eſt.* The meaning is well given by his Latin tranſlator in the Polyglott, "qui *quidem* egreſſus eſt, neque reverſus"—"He went out "*indeed*, יצא יצוא (a common Hebraiſm) but he did not return*."—And his *not returning* made Noah ſend out a dove after him; who was a more faithful meſſenger than the carnivorous raven; becauſe ſhe found nothing to tempt her to be faithleſs; as ſhe fed, not on carrion, but on grain and vegetables; which were not yet to be had.

Ver. 11. *A newly-pluckt olive-leaf.* Sam. and 1 MS. have עלי *leaves*; and Houbigant prefers this reading: "Quippe non dubium eſt hic ſignificari ſurculum oleæ virentem, pluribus foliis "inſtructum." This opinion is ſtrengthened by Syr. Onk. and the Vulgate; which have all a word denoting a branch, rather than a leaf. Joſephus too has θαλλον: Sep. has φυλλον: but two of Holmes's MSS. have φυλλων, which perhaps is the true reading; at leaſt betters the conſtruction: φυλλων ελαιας καρφος; *a branch of olive-leaves.*—The olive-tree keeps its verdure even under water; as we learn from Pliny † and Theophraſtus ‡.

Ver. 19. The arrangement of the Hebrew here is both irregular and incomplete. It is, however, an old errour; as Onkelos and Jonathan muſt have found it in their copies; not to mention the more modern Perſic tranſlator, the Erpen. Arab. and the Gr. of Venice.—I am fully perſuaded that the original order is preſerved in the Sam. copies: out of which, however, I ſuſpect a word or two have been dropped; which the Sep. and Syr. ſupply. The words dropped ſeem to be כל הבהמה Sep. παντα τα κτηνη ||; Syr. כלה בעירא. Vulg. *jumenta.*—From theſe three verſions and Sam. copy § I have compoſed my Verſion. See Various Readings.

Ver. 20. *To the Lord.* So Heb. Sam. Syr. Chald. Vulg. Gr. Ven. and all the printed editions of Sep. except Alex. But not leſs than 21 Gr. MSS.** with Copt. and both Arabs, have "*To* "*God.*"—I notice this as a matter of little importance in itſelf: but merely to ſhew that the words יהוה and אלהים have often been interchanged by copyiſts, and the one ſubſtituted for the other, either by miſtake or by caprice.—I ſhall rarely henceforth remark on ſuch tranſmutations.

Ver. 22. It is clear that, in this verſe, the author meant to denote the various ſeaſons of the circling year; but as he uſes ſix †† different terms, they cannot exactly correſpond to our four ſeaſons. The firſt two admit of no difficulty: זרע is *ſeed-time*, קציר is *harveſt:* the former of which began in Judæa about the autumnal, the latter about the vernal equinox. It is not ſo clear what is meant by קר and חום, which I have, with moſt other tranſlators, rendered *cold* and *heat.* The word קר, however, means rather a *refreſhing coolneſs*, than intenſe cold; and חום rather a *gentle warmth*, than intenſe heat. May not, then, the refreſhing breezes of *ſpring*

* Joſephus ſays, he did return: προς Νωεον επανηλθε: and Jerom Queſt. Hebr. ſays his copies read *egreſſus eſt, exiens et revertens:* ſo their teſtimony, as far as it goes, is in favour of the preſent Text.

† Hiſt. Nat. b. 13. chap. 25.

‡ Hiſt. Plant. b. 4. chap. 8.

|| They are wanting in ſome copies, and in the Coptic and Armenian verſions, made from Sep.

§ With which the Arab. of Saadias perfectly agrees.

** Add 3 Arab. MSS. 2 Armen. and the printed Armenian. One of Holmes's MSS. has both readings Κυριῳ τῳ Θεῳ.

†† The Indians count ſix ſeaſons. 1. *Seeſar*, the dewy ſeaſon. 2. *Heemat*, the cold ſeaſon. 3. *Vaſart*, the mild ſeaſon. 4. *Greeſhma*, the hot ſeaſon. 5. *Varſa*, the rainy ſeaſon. 6. *Sarat*, the breaking up of the rain.

be designed by קר, and the diminished heat of *autumn* by חום? We then shall have the four seasons in *opposition: spring and autumn, summer and winter*. Or if the author meant to arrange them in *succession*, קר may still be the vernal coolness of February, חום the genial warmth of May, קיץ the scorching heat of August, and חרף the nipping cold of November. The Alexandrian Greek translators render the whole thus: σπερμα και θερισμος, ψυχος και καυμα, θερος και εαρ. This last word they are supposed to have employed, rather than χειμων, to accommodate their version to the climate of Egypt.—It is remarkable that the Greek of Venice renders קיץ not by θερος, but by οπωρα, the autumn, or fruit-season.—The reader who wishes to have a proper idea of the seasons in Palestine, to which no doubt the author alluded, will do well to consult Harmer's *Observations on divers Passages of Scripture*; and Dr. Russel's excellent work, *The Natural History of Aleppo*; to which I shall have often occasion to refer, in the sequel of these Remarks.

CHAP. IX.

Ver. 2. *TO you I subject them all.* Lit. Into your hands I give them בידיכם נתתיו. I follow the reading of Sam. and partly of Sep. δεδωκα, or εδωκα—which, from the Copt. and Sclavon. versions, I suspect to have been originally δεδωκα αυτα; corresponding exactly with Sam.—All the other versions, with the present Heb. have, *are subjected to you*, בידיכם נתנו.—Houbigant is not pleased with either of these readings: and would supply הנם *ecce illa*, before בידיכם. But surely there is no need of this supplement. The Sam. reading is quite grammatical and full; the affix *vau* answering to the preceding כל in the singular; although it must be expressed plurally in English. I have added *all* in my version, not because I think it necessary to the integrity of the Text; but because it is virtually contained in it. I might add, that perhaps it originally stood there, as it does in the end of next verse. Chrysostom read it in his copy of Sep. παντα, and that is still the reading of one of Holmes's MSS.

Ver. 5. *From a man's own brother.* מיד איש אחיו. The Sam. copy and 8 MSS. have a *vau* before אחיו; and so Syr. and Vulg. which Houbigant prefers. Without reason; for איש אחי is only *a brother*. The comma is admirably well rendered by the Greek of Venice παρος χειρος ανδρος του αδελφου αυτου.

Ver. 6. *Whosoever, among men,* &c. האדם׳ באדם, that is, *the man, among men, who,* &c. The Vulgate, including both words in one, *quicunque*, has well and fully expressed the meaning. The common Greek Text is corrupted and unintelligible; nor do the MSS. afford any thing like a decent correction. Dr. Holmes suspects, that the original reading was αιμα το εαυτου; which, from the resemblance in old uncial MSS. between *epsilon* and *sigma*, might readily be altered into αιματος αυτε. This is an ingenious conjecture; but it does not completely heal the sore. The construction is better with the addition in Epiphanius, Cedrenus, and the Armenian edited version. Yet, still I am convinced, the Hebrew has another meaning. The Syr. and Arab. versions retain the Hebraism. Houbigant adopts the Sam. reading אדם באדם without the prefix ה, and renders "erit homo pro homine," a forced construction, and contrary to the analogy of Hebrew grammar.—Our common English version: "By man shall his "blood be shed," seems to have been formed from Onkelos, who supposes that by this is meant the

the ſentence of the magiſtrate. To the ſame purport Caſtalio, Junius, Luther, the Dutch, &c. Diodati and the Genevans ſeem to have conſidered it as a mere pleonaſm; and ſo it is: but not in the ſenſe they took it, "Colui che ſpargera il ſangue de l'huomo ne l'huomo"—"Qui "aura repandu le ſang de l'homme en l'homme."—On the whole, I am pretty confident, that I have given the true meaning.

Ver. 8. *My covenant.* בריתי. ברית from ברה, in my apprehenſion denotes a *dole*, or *portion of any meal.* It acquired the meaning of *covenant*, from the mode of verifying a contract among the orientaliſts; which was the communion of *bread* and *ſalt.*—At this day, when the Druſes have contracted with their gueſts this *ſacred* engagement, no event can make them revoke it. See the Remarks on Levit. 2. 13.

Ver. 10. *Every earthly animal.* לכל חית הארץ. This is only a general reſumption; לכל here is equivalent to את כל.—A ſenſible writer in a collection of *Commentaries and Eſſays*, &c. publiſhed by Johnſon ſome years ago, ſuſpects that a corruption has here happened in the text; and that the words above quoted are quite unneceſſary. "This conjecture (ſays he) is con-"firmed by the Septuagint Vatic. which has not this latter clauſe: and this being omitted, "all will be clear and conſiſtent; and the verſe will run thus: 'and with every living ſoul "which is with you, with the fowl, with the cattle, and with every beaſt of the earth with "you, of all that have come out of the ark.'"—I believe the reader will find nothing redundant in my verſion, which is certainly not inconſiſtent: nor indeed is there any thing redundant in the original. It is a pleonaſm, it is true, but a pleonaſm frequent not only in Hebrew, but in almoſt every other language. It is of the ſame ſort as that of verſes 2 and 3. Its omiſſion in the Greek of Sep. is not a ſufficient reaſon for rejecting it. One MS. at leaſt has it before απο παντων; and another MS. with two copies of Armen. have it after κυβωτου; where it ſtands in the Hebrew. See Holmes's Various Readings.

Ver. 12. The Latin Vulgate, miſunderſtood, has, I believe, led moſt modern tranſlators, and among theſe our own, to miſtranſlate a part of this verſe: "This is the token of the covenant "which I *make* *," *Hoc ſignum fœderis, quod do.* The Latin is, indeed, ambiguous; becauſe *ſignum* and *fœdus* are both of the neuter gender; and either of them may be the antecedent to *quod:* and if our tranſlators had uſed *give* inſtead of *make*, their verſion, although apparently ambiguous, would have been ſuſceptible of the genuine meaning. For it is evident from the context that את, not ברית, is the antecedent to אשר. Yet even Dathe himſelf has followed the common track; without leaving a chance of miſtaking him: "Pignus vero illius *pro-*"*miſſionis quam* vobis... dedi."—Not ſo the Septuagint: Τουτο το σημειον της διαθηκης, ὁ εγω διδωμι. So the Greek of Venice: το δε το σημειον της ξυνθηκης, ὁ διδωμι. So alſo more explicitly Caſtalio: *Pignus autem, quo pignore volo hoc*, &c. Hezel, too, has here corrected Luther's verſion: and Michaëlis has, by a proper arrangement, made his tranſlation clear and complete. "Dis iſt das zeichen des bundes zwiſhen mir, und euch, &c.... das ich ewige zeiten ver "ordne."

Ver. 16. Houbigant makes the whole verſe a part of the Hiſtorian's narrative; and not of God's ſpeech. "Et fuit arcus in nubibus, apparuitque ut monumentum eſſet," &c. But he

* Bate and Delgado have rectified this miſtranſlation.

has all the antient verſions againſt him, and all the MSS. alſo; although he preſſes the Sam. into his ſervice. His great ſtreſs is laid upon the word אלהים; as if God could not coherently ſay that he would remember the covenant "between God and all ſorts of animals;" but would in that caſe have ſaid "between me," &c.—But ſurely the good Father did not here attend to the Hebrew idiom; which moſt frequently ſubſtitutes the perſon for the pronoun.—Here *God* is equivalent to *me*; and ſo I have rendered it in my verſion.

Ver. 18. *Ham* (*the father of Chanaan*). This parentheſis is evidently inſerted here, to prepare the reader for what follows, ver. 25.

Ver. 20. *Noah began*, &c. It is not neceſſary to ſuppoſe that he had not cultivated the ground before.—He only began anew to cultivate it after the deluge—and, among other agricultural operations, he planted a vineyard; of the grapes of that plantation he expreſſed wine; and having drunk too much of this wine, the ſtrength of which he did not probably yet know, he was inebriated; and, in conſequence of that inebriation, fell aſleep in an indecent and naked poſture. Such is the ſubſtance of the ſtory; than which nothing can be more natural. But our commentators are not content with that. Mr. Julius Bate informs us, that "he lay down "for a divine dream, which they prepared for by wine; which naturally leads to ſleep and dream-"ing. The earth was now to be divided, and Noah wanted directions from heaven on that head; "and had them, as we learn, by what he ſaw in his dream: it contains the hiſtory of the whole "world; which would *hardly* have been revealed to a drunken man."—Hardly.

Ver. 22. I have ſaid in my explanatory note, that the crime of Ham ſeems to have been a voluntary contemptuous inſpection of his father's nakedneſs; and the ſtill more wanton indecency of leaving his father thus expoſed. He ſhould certainly have covered him ſecretly, without communicating the incident even to his own brothers: every filial heart muſt feel the impropriety of his conduct.

Ver. 25. *Accurſed be Chanaan*, &c. Much learned conjecture has been employed to elucidate this paſſage. Some have imagined that *Chanaan* is here erroneouſly placed for *Ham*, which is the reading of the Aldine ed. of Sep. and of 7 of Holmes's MSS.*—Others ſuppoſe that חם אבי *Ham the father of* are wanting before *Chanaan*; and ſupply them accordingly; partly from the Arabic verſion (אבו כנעאן) and partly from the chimerical rules of Hebrew metre, as laid down by Hare.—But neither of theſe authorities is ſufficient to juſtify an alteration in the preſent text; in which there is no variety of lection either in the Sam. or Hebr. copies: and with which all the other antient verſions perfectly agree. Were this alteration even allowed, it would not much mend the matter: for, if Ham was only to be curſed, why curſe him under the denomination of *the father of Chanaan?*

At any rate, to be conſiſtent with themſelves as well as with their pretended metrical canons, they ſhould, with the more conſiſtent Arabic tranſlator, inſert the ſame words before *Chanaan* in verſes 26 and 27, without which the burthen of the curſe, i. e. *ſubjection to his brethren*, ſtill

* I have ſometimes imagined that the reading Χαμ, in the Aldine and other copies, may have ariſen from an abbreviation of Χανααν; thus Χᾱν. The μ and ν, in many Greek MSS., are to be diſtinguiſhed only by the length of the left leg, which in μ is much ſhorter than in ν: ſo that this latter actually more reſembles our common μ than it does the ν itſelf of thoſe days: and this mode of orthography is preſerved throughout the Greek New Teſtament of the edition of Alcala

falls

falls on Chanaan. But this would have been as hoſtile to their *metre*, by being too long, as the preſent line is by being too ſhort.

The Text, I think, is ſufficiently clear as it ſtands; and highly expreſſive of what we may ſuppoſe to have been the feelings of Noah on this occaſion. On awaking, he learns that Ham has uſed him moſt irreverently, while his other ſons had ſhewed him that filial regard which was due to ſuch a venerable father. To expreſs his indignation at ſo infamous a conduct, he curſes Ham in his progeny, and in *him* of his progeny who was, probably, moſt dear to him, as being his youngeſt ſon*, perhaps juſt then born; and whoſe very name, which imports the idea of depreſſive humiliation, might readily offer a paronomaſiacal alluſion; ſo common in the maledictions and benedictions of the patriarchs.—Whether this maledict̃ion were prophetic or imprecatory; whether it were really made by Noah, or whether the whole be not a poſt-liminious tale, contrived by the Hebrew hiſtoriographer for the purpoſe of throwing an odium on the Chanaanites, and juſtifying the conqueſt of their country; are points which I mean not now to diſcuſs: but it is pretty clear, that the ſtory, true or falſe, is here introduced, to pave the way for a more ſpecial command from Heaven to conquer and extirpate the Chanaanite nations.

Ver. 26. *Bleſſed of the Lord, my God, be Shem:* "More natural (ſays Archbiſhop Secker †) "than the common verſion, *Bleſſed be the Lord, the God of Shem:* for why ſhould he be the "God of Shem, more than of Japheth?"—and I add, than of Ham. The ſame mode of phraſing occurs chap. 24. ver. 3. "Come in, thou bleſſed of the Lord;" and Deut. 33. 31. "Bleſſed by the Lord be his land."—For the reſt, I ſuſpect the word יהוה *the Lord* to be an interpolation ‡.—It is remarkable, that both Arabs have *God*, inſtead of *the Lord*. Saad. תבארך אללה' אלה סאם. Erp. מבארך אללה' אלה שם.

Ib. *May he dwell in tents of renown.* I have here done what, I doubt not, will be called an audacious deed. I have, contrary to all the copies of the Text, and all the antient verſions, tranſpoſed a whole comma from one verſe to another; and applied to *Shem*, what, in the preſent arrangement, is applicable only to *Japheth*; or, according to others, to God.—The truth is, I long demurred, in my mind, whether I ſhould riſk ſo bold a tranſpoſition: the following conſideration, at length, determined me.—To both the other names there is a manifeſt alluſion, or paronomaſia: is it credible that there was not one alſo to that of Shem? Shem ſignifies *renown, celebrity, fame:* the comma ישכן באהלי שם *may he dwell in tents of renown* ||, is, then, much more applicable to him than to Japheth; eſpecially as the latter has his own proper paronomaſia יפת אלהים ליפת *May God enlarge Japheth* §: for ſo I have rendered, in my verſion, becauſe I then thought that the Greek and Vulgate had properly expreſſed the meaning by πλατυναι and *dilatet*. I have ſince ſometimes doubted, whether the Arabic of Saadias offer not a better verſion, יחסן *benefaciat*. The word פתא in Arabic has a nearly ſimilar

* See chap. 10. ver. 6.

† In his MS. Notes on the Bible, at Lambeth.

‡ See the Remark already referred to in the note ‡, p. 50.

|| So, before me, Michaëlis had rendered this comma, although he applies it to Japheth. "Er wohne in berühmten "wohnungen."

§ The word ſignifies *enlarged*.

meaning,

meaning, and Dathe has accordingly rendered "Fortunet Deus Japhetum." On the other hand, פתה in Chald. and פתא in Syr. have meanings that ſeem ſtrongly to ſupport the Greek verſion: and in the ſame dialect פתת ſignifies to *increaſe greatly*, which is equivalent to *enlarge*. I am therefore ſtill inclined to lean to that ſide. The Arab. of Erpenius has a word of the ſame purport, יסע; and the Greek of Venice has ερευνοι.—I have hinted that ſome interpreters make *God* the nominative to ישכן *may he dwell:* but this is evidently a forced and unnatural explication.

In both verſes, I have rendered, *his ſervant*, on the authority of Sep. Vulg. and Arab. The preſent Text has למו in both places; and in the ſecond place all the verſions, ſave the three forementioned ones: but in the firſt place, Jonathan and, what is more remarkable, the Greek of Venice have his, ליה, αυτου. Perhaps we ſhould half the difference, and read *his*, לו, in ver. 26. and *their*, למו, in ver. 27. And, indeed, if the preſent arrangement be right, and if my tranſpoſition be wrong, למו here would be neceſſary: and the rendering of the Greek of Venice the beſt of all, τελοιη τε Κενααν οικετης σφων. *May Chanaan be a ſlave to both.* See Houbigant's note on the place.

CHAP. X

THIS chapter contains a ſhort account of the poſterity of the ſons of Noah, who, after the deluge, are ſuppoſed to have re-peopled the earth. By comparing it with the 27th chapter of Ezekiel, we find that ſeveral of the nations, here mentioned, ſtill bore the ſame names in the days of that prophet. Hence the two chapters ſerve, in ſome degree, to elucidate one another. But, with all this light, we are too often obliged to grope our way, with reſpect to the relative ſituations of thoſe various peoples; and much more ſo with regard to their preſent appellations. A proper name is apt to aſſume a new form every time it is tranſlated into a different language, and often even in the ſame dialect at different periods: ſometimes to ſuch a degree, that the original term is hardly diſcernible: and probable conjecture muſt ſupply the place of certainty. The labours of Bochart, Le Clerc, Wells, Michaëlis, and Forſter, not to mention many other inferior writers, have almoſt exhauſted the ſubject of this chapter: and little is left for future gleaners: until a more minute deſcription of the Aſiatic regions ſhall be made by a traveller well acquainted with all the various dialects, that are ſpoken, from the Indus to the Nile, and from the Arabic gulph to the Caſpian ſea.

I ſhall here, from the aforeſaid writers, and my own obſervations, lay before the reader a brief notice of the nations ſuppoſed to be deſigned in this geographical genealogy: which, if it were written by Moſes, is the moſt antient fragment extant of the ſort.

Ver. 2. *Gomer* is ſuppoſed to be the father of the *Cymmerians*, or *Cimmerians*; that is, of the antient *Celts* who dwelled between the Boryſthenes and the Tanais, and in the Tauric Cherſoneſus.—*Magog* is the father of their neighbours the *Scythians* or Tartars—*Madai*, of the *Medes*—*Javan*, of the *Ionians*, or more antient Greeks—*Thubal*, of the *Tibareni*—*Moſhoch*, of the *Moſchi*.

Ver.

Ver. 3. *The ſons of Gomer*, i. e. the nations deſcended from him, are *Aſchenaz*, the inhabitants of Phrygia-Minor and Bithynia—*Riphath*, or *Dephath*, the Paphlagonians according to Joſephus: but the very orthography of the word is uncertain: it being written ſometimes with a *reſh*, and ſometimes with a *daleth:* but in this the authority of Joſephus is conſiderable; which is in favour of *reſh*.—*Thogarmah*, the *Armenians*.

Ver. 4. *The ſons of Javan*, or colonies of Ionia, are *Eliſh*, or *Hellas*,—*Tharſhiſh*, *Tarteſſus* in Spain.—*Chethim*, the firſt inhabitants of *Italy*.—*Rodanim**, the inhabitants of *Gallia Rhodanenſis*.

Ver. 5. *From theſe...were the inſular nations diſtinguiſhed.* I have ſaid, in my explanatory note, that the Hebrews ſo denominated, not only real iſlands, but, in general, all thoſe maritime or tranſmarine nations with which their uſual communication was by ſea.—Michaëlis ſolves the difficulty another way. From the Arabic אוי, *to inhabit*, he derives איים; and thinks it denotes habitations, or reſidences, of any ſort, whether inſular or not. This idea is adopted by Dathe, who renders: "ab his originem habent regionum *exterarum* incolæ."—I cannot eaſily acquieſce in this interpretation. For, firſt, although the word אי may ſometimes be fitly enough rendered a *reſidence* or *habitation*; it does not from this follow, that ſuch is its original meaning. Every peopled iſland is an habitation, but every habitation is not an iſland. 2. The moſt antient Greek verſion has νησοι †, and the Latin Vulg. *inſulæ:* and although the Syr. and Chald. may be bended to the ſame meaning which Michaëlis would give to the Hebrew; they have been generally tranſlated *inſulæ*; and, in ſome paſſages, can hardly be tranſlated otherwiſe. 3. The meaning of the Arabic verb אוי is too vague and uncertain, on which to found a ſure etymon. Itſelf may be a denominative from ſome other root; as I believe all verbs, in all languages, to be. Had it been conſidered by the Arabs themſelves as the root of the Hebrew אי, it is moſt probable, that they would in their verſions have retained the Hebrew word, or an Arabic word ſimilar to it: whereas both Saadias and Erp. have words denoting iſlands properly ſo called; namely גזאיר and אגזר.—I am therefore inclined to think that the original meaning of אי is an *iſland:* but that its uſage in Hebrew was extended, as I have ſaid, to all thoſe nations which were ſeparated from Paleſtine, Arabia, and Syria, by ſeas.—The very word is yet retained in almoſt all the Teutonic dialects, and ſtill denotes an *iſland*. Dan. *öe*. Swed. *öo*. Belgic. *ey-lant*; and ſo our Saxon *eg-land* (pron. *ey-land* or *ÿ-land*) which we ſtill find in many compounds, ſuch as *Rams-ey*, *Sheep-ey*, *Hert-ey*, *Eel-y* †. See Junius's Etymologicum, ed. Lye.

Ver. 6. *The ſons* (or *progeny*) *of Ham were—Chuſh*, that is, the *Ethiopians*; who firſt inhabited Arabia and thence colonized Habeſſinia, by paſſing over the Red-ſea.—*Mizraim* are, no doubt, the *Egyptians—Phut*, the *Libyans—Chanaan*, the *Chanaanites*, or *Phœnicians*.

Ver. 7. *The ſons of Chuſh—Sebah*, ſuppoſed to have inhabited *Meroë*, an iſland of the Nile—*Havilah*, different from that mentioned ver. 29. and ſuppoſed to be the preſent *Haulan*, or *Chaulan* of Yemen or Arabia Felix—*Sabthah*, placed by Bochart in Perſia, but this is highly improbable. Joſephus ſays they were the people called by the Greeks Ασαβαριοι. Jonathan

* Here again is a variety of lection *Dodanim*; which Michaëlis takes to be *Epirus*, where was the oracle of *Dodona*. The name is altogether wanting in Joſephus.

† So alſo the Greek of Venice. ‡ And, in Scotland, I-Colm-kill.

ſays

ſays they were the הנדקי the Indians. We muſt look for them, I think, either in Africa or Arabia.—*Raamah*, or *Raghma*, has been ſuppoſed to be *Rhegma*, on the Perſic gulph: but Michaëlis is inclined to think it is *Reama*, a large mercantile town of Yemen.—*Sabthechah*, whom Jonathan calls זיננאי, is thought to be the *Zingis* of Ptolemy, between Ethiopia and Egypt.

The ſons of Raamah were—*Shebah*, the *Sabæans* of Arabia, who were afterwards confounded with the Joktanite tribe of the ſame name.—*Dedan* is the preſent *Daden*, not far from the mouth of the Perſic gulph.—It muſt be confeſſed that much of all this is mere conjecture: but, as I mean to treat on the ſubject in a particular diſſertation, I ſhall here but ſlightly touch on it, to make room for other more important matters.

Ver. 8. *Chuſh was alſo the progenitor of Nimrod.*—This *Nimrod* is called ver. 9. גבור ציד, which is rendered by Sep. γιγας κυνηγος. Vulg. *robuſtus venator*. Onk. גבר תקיף. Tharg. גיבר מרודא. Syr. * גנברא נחשיתנא. Arab. Pol. גבארא מחשפא. Arab. Erp. גבארא פי אלציאדה. Perſ. גבאר נחגיר. Gr. Ven. κραταιος θηρατηρ. All which terms are more or leſs equivalent to our common Engliſh verſion "a mighty hunter."—He was, indeed, a mighty hunter: but his predations were not confined to the brute creation:

"Proud Nimrod, firſt, the bloody chaſe began,
"A mighter hunter—and his prey was man."

Joſephus calls him τολμηρος, και κατα χειρα γενναιος, *a bold enterpriſing man*, who perſuaded the people to throw off the fear of God, and ſubmit to his domination.—Whether he literally hunted them down, like wild beaſts, with dogs; or whether it be only a metaphorical expreſſion; it ſeems clear, that he oppreſſed and ſubjugated his fellow creatures, and was, according to our hiſtorian, the firſt deſpotic tyrant. His very name, which was probably given him after his death, not aſſumed by himſelf, denotes an *arrogant rebellious* man: hence it is well ſaid that he was *a mighty hunter* (or, as I have rendered, *a powerful plunderer*) *in deſpite of the Lord* † לפני יהוה, i. e. ſays very properly Roſenmüller, "vidente et indignante Deo; cujus "excuſſo metu ac reverentia, vi fraternum opprimere genus auderet."

Some moderns, however, with Aben-Ezrah, give the whole paſſage another turn; and imagine that what is here ſaid of Nimrod, is ſaid to his praiſe. He was a great man, even *in the ſight of God*. But this appears to me a very ſtrained interpretation; although it has been adopted by ſome learned men ‡.

Ver. 11. *From that land* (the land of Shinar) *he went into Aſſyria*. מן הארץ ההוא || יצא אשור, which is commonly rendered "Out of that land went Aſhur." Εκ της γης εκεινης εξηλθεν Ασσουρ. *De terra illa egreſſus eſt Aſſur*. So all the antient verſions ſave Onkelos and Tharg. Bab. both which render as I have done. The latter in particular is explicit. "Out of that country

* The Syrian writer, Ephræm, ſays this is a Perſic term, unknown to him: and indeed it has much the air of an exotic word: yet I find it not in any Perſic vocabulary: and the Perſic tranſlator here uſes a very different term.

† Sep. adds *God;* but this addition is wanting in 5 MSS. and in two copies of the Arab. verſion, made from Sep.—On the other hand, both the Pol. and Erp. Arab. have *God* inſtead of *the Lord*.

‡ Such as Heſſe, Jeruſalem, Vogel, Le Clerc.

‖ The preſent Heb. has והוא, but 10 MSS. with the Sam. have the right reading והיא.

"Nimrod

" Nimrod went, and reigned in Aſſyria;...and, leaving thoſe four cities, built other four, Ni-
" nivé," &c. Bochart and Le Clerc have ſo well defended this verſion, that I was forced by conviction to adopt it: although the current of commentators is againſt us. The only reaſonable objection that can be made is, that there is no ה after אשר. But it is well known that this affix is not unfrequently omitted, after names of places: and its omiſſion here is not ſufficient to overſet the probability that Nimrod, and not Aſhur, is the nominative to יצא *egreſſus eſt*.—We find no perſon of the name of *Aſhur*, but the ſecond ſon of *Shem*, mentioned ver. 22. But to introduce him here confounds the narration; and would be a moſt ill-placed parentheſis indeed. Whereas, by applying the words to Nimrod, all is clear and conſentaneous. This powerful man, after having erected his *firſt empire* in the land of Shinar, went out of that land and made himſelf maſter of Aſſyria, where he built four other cities, beſides thoſe which he had built in the land of *Shinar*, or *Babylon*. See Bochart, l. iv. c. 12. and what Michaëlis has ſaid againſt his opinion in his *Spicilegium*, part 1. p. 235, &c.

Ver. 12. *The great city*. I refer this to Ninivé; which, wherever it is mentioned in the Hebrew writings, is ſo denominated. Michaëlis, who thinks that Ninivé, in the time of Moſes, was not a great city, has no doubt of *Reſen* being here deſigned as *the great* city. But I, who no where elſe find either *Reſen*, or *Chalah*, called a great city, or even ever mentioned but here, have a very great doubt: ſo great that I cannot believe that any other city than Ninivé is alluded to. It is not neceſſary to ſuppoſe that Ninivé was *a great* city in the days of Moſes: as it has never yet been proved that this geographical chart was drawn by Moſes. At any rate, there is no ſtronger proof that *Chalah* or *Reſen* was a great city in the days of Moſes, than that Ninivé was a great city.

Ver. 13. *From Mizraim ſprang the Ludites*, &c. We know ſo little of theſe peoples, or of their reſpective habitations, that it ſeems wiſer to paſs them over in ſilence, than riſk vain conjecture. Nor is the preciſe ſituation even of the Chanaanite nations exactly known: we only learn from ver. 19. their general boundaries: and, with reſpect to theſe, the Samaritan copy differs from the Hebrew. See the next remark.

Ver. 19. *From the river of Egypt*, &c. This is the Samaritan reading, which I prefer to the Hebrew, for the following reaſons. In the promiſe made to Abraham, chap. 15. ver. 18, 19, 20, 21. the very ſame boundaries are aſſigned to the land of Chanaan in all the copies, which are here marked in the Samaritan: and the ſame number of peoples, or tribes, included in them. Again, in Exod. 23. 31. the ſame boundaries are deſigned in a more particular manner: " from the Red-ſea to the ſea of the Philiſtines, (that is, the Mediterranean) and from the " wilderneſs *of Shur* to the great river Euphrates." It is true, this was not accompliſhed until the reigns of David and Solomon: which latter is expreſsly ſaid in the firſt book of Kings, chap. 4. ver. 20. to have had dominion " over all the kingdoms from the river *Euphrates* unto " the land of the Philiſtines, and unto the borders of Egypt."

But whence ſprang the preſent reduction of thoſe boundaries in the Hebrew Text of Geneſis? That I know not: but I ſuſpect it aroſe from this; that when the compiler, or tranſcriber, of the preſent copy of the Hebrew Text lived, the boundaries of Judæa had been greatly circumſcribed: and he accommodated his text to that circumſcription.—But why, then, left he the other two paſſages unaltered? This, indeed, I cannot account for, nor am I obliged to account

for it. But this I affirm, the preſent Hebrew text is inconſiſtent with itſelf: the Samaritan is conſiſtent: let the reader chooſe, by whether of the two he will abide.

Ver. 21. *To Shem were ſons alſo born.* ולשם יולד גם. Theſe words are rendered by Dathe thus: "A Semo multæ gentes habent originem," which we might expreſs more briefly "Shem "had a numerous progeny," or, ſtill more literally in Latin: *Shemo nata eſt copia.* This verſion is founded on the Arabic ſignification of גם; which I render *alſo*; and it muſt be allowed that the interpretation is moſt ingenious. Yet I cannot think, that it was here intended by the original author. If he had meant to denote the multitude of Shem's children, he would, moſt probably, have uſed another mode of phraſing: ſuch as בני שם רבו, or לשם ילדים רבים. In no other place of Hebrew ſcripture, not even in poetry, is גם uſed in the Arabic ſignification. Nor is the Arabic ſignification itſelf, in my apprehenſion, applicable to a *numerous progeny* any more than נמע, of which perhaps it is an abbreviated form. It ſignifies a *collection, heap, abundance* of material things; but never, I believe, a *multitude* of men. All the antient tranſlators took גם for a particle. If any of them could have ſuſpected it to be a noun, it muſt have been the Arabs; and then doubtleſs they would have retained the word, if their own גם or נמע had been applicable to a numerous poſterity.—But גם ſeems here a mere expletive!—It is not more ſo than δε is moſt frequently in Greek; in which language a literal verſion of the Hebrew would be Τῳ δε Σεμῳ γεγενηται.—For the reſt, I agree with Dathe, that הוא is to be conſtructed with the following אבי, as the Arab. Pol. well renders והו אבו. So the Greek of Venice, although badly pointed in the printed edition, κεινος πατηρ παντων των υἱεων Εβερου.

Ib. *Japheth's eldeſt brother.* אחי יפת הגדול. I have ſaid in my explanatory note, that the common rendering of theſe words is contrary to grammatical analogy, and only founded on a doubtful chronological hypotheſis. Thus it is argued: "When Noah begot his eldeſt ſon he "was 500 years old, Gen. 5. 32. But Shem was 100 years old, two years after the deluge, "Gen. 11. 10. He could not therefore be the eldeſt ſon of Noah. Hence we muſt neceſ-"ſarily render the Hebrew words *the brother of Japheth the elder.*"—Muſt we? Then adieu all rules of grammar! Let ſuch another example of conſtruction be produced from the whole body of Hebrew ſcriptures; and I ſhall acquieſce in the interpretation: although I ſhould deem the remark of the writer a very inſignificant one. The intention of the writer was evidently to mark the ſeniority and conſequent ſuperiority of Shem. He had already told us, chap. 9. ver. 24. that *Cham* was, if not the youngeſt, at leaſt the younger ſon of Noah: he now is careful to tell us that *Shem*, the ſtem of the Hebrews, was elder than Japheth. This is quite natural: but to tell us that Shem was *the brother of Japheth the elder** is an uncouth mode of expreſſion in any language; and is altogether contrary to the idiom of the Hebrew.—But how is the chronological difficulty to be reſolved? I care not whether it be reſolved or not: although I think it no arduous taſk. Every one knows that the centuries marked in the Hebrew annals are not always real centuries. When Shem is ſaid to have begotten Arphaxad, when he was 100 years old; he may have been not only two, but three or more years old than juſt the hundred.—Wherever the ſons of Noah are mentioned together, *Shem*

* The Septuagint verſion only is favourable to this meaning: but I am perſuaded that it is corrupted; and that the true reading is either αδελφου; which is that of 1 MS. or rather τῳ μειζονι (for τϐ μειζονος), which is the reading of 7 MSS. of the Sclavonic and Oſtrogothic verſions, and of Auſtin. See Dr. Holmes's Various Readings.

is

is always put at the head of them. I do not call this a concluſive argument for his primogeniture: but it is a ſtrong preſumptive one.—Beſides, who will ſay that the chronology of Geneſis is a certain chronology? Who, for example, can eaſily believe that Noah was full 500 years old, before he begot any children? It is certainly highly improbable.

Ver. 22. *The ſons* (that is, the poſterity) *of Shem were:*

Elam. The Elamites, who inhabited the country between Suſiana and Media.—*Aſhur*, the Aſſyrians, whoſe capital was Ninivé.—*Arphaxad*, who appears to have peopled that part of Aſſyria called by Ptolemy Arrapachites. See Schlözer's Memoir *Von den Chaldäeren*, in Eichhorn's Repertorium, tom. 8. p. 113.—LUD is generally ſuppoſed to be the father of the Lydians: ſo Joſephus ὑς δε Λυδες νυν καλουσι. But where was their country? We know no other Lydia but that of Aſia Minor, between the river Halys and the Ægean ſea; anciently called Mæonia. Michaëlis ſuſpected that the writer meant to deſcribe ſome nation much farther eaſt; and that the original reading might be חוד or הנד, that is, *India*, which the Arabs ſtill call אלהנד. The *Ludites* are by Jerem. 46. 9. claſſed with *Chuſh* and *Phut*; and by Ezek. 27. 10. with *Pharas* (Perſia) and *Phut*. And this is all that we know of the matter.—*Aram* is, doubtleſs, *Syria*.

Ver. 23. *The ſons of Aram* were: *Uz*, the country of Job, is probably that tract of country between Palæſtine and Cœlo-Syria; called by the Greek tranſlator of Job Αυσιτις. The Arabs of the preſent time, giving a hard ſound to the *ain*, and changing as uſual the *tſade* into *teth* or *ta*, call it *Ghauta* עוטה; Arab. Saad. אלעוטה. But Arab. Erp. retains the Hebrew word עוץ.—*Hul* is *Armenia*, according to Joſephus and S. Jerom. Michaëlis imagines it to be *Cœlo-Syria*.—*Gether* is conjectured to be the country bounded by the river *Centrites*, on the borders of Armenia.—*Maſh*, מש, called in the Sam. text משא; in Chron. משך * (which is the reading of Sep. here Μοσοχ), is ſuppoſed with ſome degree of probability to be the region about mount *Maſius*; from which flows the *Maſca* (Μασκα) of Xenophon, otherwiſe called the *Saocoras*; but by the Arabs *Hermas*, הרמאס. See Michaëlis's *Spicileg.* part 2. p. 141.

Ver. 24. *Arphaxad begot Cainan.* This generation is in neither the Sam. nor Heb. text: nor in any of the antient verſions ſave Sep. and hence it has been generally deemed an interpolation. Dr. Jackſon, in the 1ſt vol. of his *Chronological Antiquities*, labours hard to ſhew that the reading of the Septuagint is the true original reading, and that it ſtood in the original copies until after the Chriſtian æra. It is, indeed, hard to ſay by what means it could have got into the Septuagint verſion, if it had not been found in their Hebrew copy. It muſt have been in the copy uſed by Luke in forming his genealogy of Jeſus Chriſt. In ſhort, it is not eaſy to conceive how ſuch an interpolation could have been made; or for what purpoſe: whereas its having been dropt out of the Hebrew text may be readily accounted for.—Such are the arguments in favour of the Septuagint.

On the other hand, the conformity of the Sam. with the Heb. copies; the ſilence of Joſephus and Philo; and its omiſſion in the chronological computations of Julius Africanus, Euſebius, and Theophilus; are urged as cogent proofs that the paſſage was not in the original copies of the Septuagint: and Grotius goes ſo far as to aſſert that it was not to be found there, before the fourth century. But how came it at all to be inſerted? Why, it was firſt foiſted

* One of Kennicott's MSS. has here משך with a *daleth*; which *daleth* may have been intended for a final *chaph*.

into Luke's goſpel by ſome careleſs copyiſt from ver. 37, where it rightly occurs; and this interpolation, being tranſcribed by other copyiſts, got imperceptibly into almoſt all the exemplars: and on theſe exemplars the copies of the Septuagint were next interpolated, to make them agree with the Evangeliſt.—This, if not an impoſſible, is certainly a ſtrange, moſt rapid, and to me almoſt an incredible proceſs. For we find this ſame interpolated *Cainan* in the Syr. Vulg. Arab. and Ethiopic verſions.—On the whole, then, I am ſtrongly inclined to think that the comma in queſtion ſtood originally in the Septuagint verſion, and that Luke drew his genealogy from that verſion. The point, indeed, is not worth contending about: and therefore I diſmiſs it with indifference. The reader may take what ſide he pleaſes. It is but fair, however, to inform him, that the comma is wanting in 3 of Holmes's MSS. in the Coptic * and Armen. edited copies, and in 1 Arab. MS. Nor was it read by Theophilus; nor by Jerom in his Heb. Queſtions; where he ſays (in expreſs terms) "Arphaxad genuit Sela."

Verſes 26, 27, 28. *Joktan*, *Jectan*, or *Kahtan* † is univerſally allowed to have ſettled in *Jemen*, or rather in *Iemen*; and the Arabs at this day acknowledge him for their firſt patriarch.—His ſons were, *Almodad*, of whom I find no trace in the geography of Arabia.—*Shalepb* is, with ſome degree of probability, ſuppoſed to be the founder of the *Salapenian* nation, mentioned by Ptolemy, in the interior of Arabia.—*Hazarmoth* is evidently the Arabic *Hadramuth*, חצרמות of Jemen. See Buſching's Aſia, p. 697.—*Jerah* is, according to Michaëlis, the ſame with *Gobbel-kamar*. This is a mere etymological conjecture: *Jerah* ירח in Hebrew, and *kamar* קמר in Arabic, ſignifying *the Moon*. See Buſching, p. 704.—*Haduram*. Bochart finds in this name the *Drimati* of Pliny.—*Uzal* is the preſent *Sanaa* of Jemen. See Niebuhr and Buſching.—*Diclah* is placed by Bochart in the country of the *Minæi*: but Michaëlis would place his reſidence from the mouth of the Tigris (in Syr. דקלת) to the Perſian gulph.—Of *Obal* and *Abimael* we find no certain traces.—*Sheba* is the country of the *Sabæans*.—Of *Ophir* I ſhall have occaſion to ſpeak in another place.—*Havilah* is very probably the preſent *Hhaulan* or *Chaulan* חולאן. See Buſching, p. 652.—*Jobab*, the *Jobabites* of Ptolemy; now the diſtrict of Hamdan. See Michaëlis; and Buſching, p. 689.

Ver. 30. *Amongſt the eaſtern mountains, from Meſha unto Sephar*. The original text is ממשא באכה ספרה הר הקדים; which is commonly rendered "From Meſha, as thou goeſt, unto Sephar "a mount of the eaſt." So our common verſion, and ſo equivalently all the antient verſions, with ſome variety of lection, in the two proper names, hardly deſerving to be noticed. Michaëlis, pointing the Hebrew thus, ויהי מושבם׳ ממשא באכה ספרה׳ הר הקדים. tranſlates or rather paraphraſes: "Und ihre wohnungen ſind, von Baſſora an, bis an Arabiſche provinz "Tahama, die gebürgigten gegenden, die uns gegen morgen liegen." More literally Dathe: "Quorum habitationes a Meſcha uſque ad Sepharam patent; quæ regio montana eſt verſus "Orientem." Both conſider הר הקדים as the relative, not of ספר, but of מושב.—Although I have adopted their mode of rendering in my verſion, I confeſs that I am not now ſo fully ſatisfied with it as I then was. I have ſome conſiderable doubt, if ſuch another mode of conſtruction can readily be found: and that in order to juſtify *our* verſions, the words הר הקדים

* This verſion has *Cainan*; but makes him one of the ſons of Shem; and places him after *Aram*. † So he is called by the Arabs, קחטאן.

ſhould

ſhould ſtand immediately after משבם. Yet, what is very remarkable, the author of the Gr. verſion of Venice ſeems ſo to have underſtood his text: Υπηρξε δε ἡ καθεδρα σφων, απο Μαισαης, τῳ απικνεισθαι σε Σεφωρην δε, ορος της ανατολης.—I therefore heſitate between the two tranſlations; and leave the reader to make his own election: although I am rather inclined to believe the more antient one the better, at leaſt more agreeable to the common rules of Hebrew grammar.

But where are the two boundaries, *Meſha* and *Sephar*, to be found? To find them is no eaſy taſk.—Bochart will have *Meſha* to be the *Muſa* of Ptolemy, a celebrated ſea-port town on the extremity of the Arabic gulph, or Red-ſea; not far from the preſent port of *Moccha*. Michaëlis objects to this, becauſe the Arabic name is not משא nor even מסא, but מוזע *Muzaa*: "Hæc ſi vera ſcriptio nominis Arabici, *Meſcha* Moſis eſſe omnino nequit." This I think too ſtrong an aſſertion: for, although it is not uſual with the Arabs to change ש into ז, nor א into ע *; who will affirm that this may not have happened in the name of a place? Or who knows if Niebuhr's informer was a grammarian, who knew perfectly the orthography of *Muza*? The Muſa of Ptolemy and Bochart is certainly a proper place to be called one of the boundaries of Arabia Felix. But where is the other extremity *Sephar* to be found? Niebuhr imagined it might be ספאר *Daphar* on the Indian ocean, a ſea-port town in the province of *Seger*: and this appears to me the moſt probable conjecture that has been made: much more probable than that of Michaëlis, who makes *Meſha*, *Miſene* or *Baſſora*, and ſeeks his *Sephar* on the ſhore of *Thehama*. *Sephar* in Chald. Syr. and Arab. ſignifies, indeed, a *ſhore*. But *Sephar* here is called a *mountain*, and not *a ſhore*: at leaſt according to the common, and I now think the better interpretation of the ſentence: and the incenſe mountains in the province of *Seger* may here be alluded to. The only plauſible objection of Michaëlis is, that the writer would not, probably, deſign the boundaries of the Joktanites by two maritime points: "Si ita limites Joctanitidis definiret "[Moſes] idem aut pejus faceret, ac ſi quis in Germania geographus Hiſpaniæ fines a duobus "portibus deſcribens, *Gadibus Tarraconem uſque extendi* diceret *Hiſpaniam*; reliquos terminos, "ipſoſque montes Pyrenæos omittens." But Moſes, or whoever made this deſcription, does not profeſs to give the boundaries of the Joktanites like a German geographer. He only ſays, their reſidence was between two points, *Meſha* and *Sephar*. And, admitting Michaëlis's own interpretation, the deſcription would be equally defective, conſidered as a delineation of boundaries: for a line from *Miſené* to the *ſhore* of Thehama, cannot better determine the geographical limits of the reſidence of the Joktanites, than a line from *Muza* to *Daphar*. But ſee *Spicileg.* part 2. p. 204, &c.

CHAP. XI.

Ver. 2. *FROM their firſt reſidence*, מקדם, which is commonly rendered *from the eaſt*. But it has been objected to this, that if Noah's ſons firſt ſettled in Armenia, where the ark is ſuppoſed to have reſted, the builders of Babel muſt have proceeded *from the north*, not *from the eaſt*, to the land of Shinar. Hence, Houbigant and others tranſlate *eaſt-ward*, againſt grammar; and equally liable to objection: for neither is Shinar eaſt-ward from Armenia, nor is it certain that Noah's

* Which however they ſometimes do.

children

children ſettled in Armenia: they would, more probably, return to the place in which they had lived before the deluge; if within their reach. The difficulty is better reſolved by ſaying, that the Jews ſeem to have called *eaſt*, every country that lay between them and the riſing ſun: not to mention, that, according to ſome modern relations, the meridian of mount Ararat is at leaſt two degrees more eaſterly than that of Babylon. All the antient tranſlators have *from the eaſt*; except Onk. and Perſ., who underſtood קדם in a different ſenſe; namely, the *firſt* ſettlement of mankind after the deluge: and this meaning of the word I have preferred in my Verſion; and rendered, *from their firſt reſidence:* which removes every ſtumbling-block.

Ver. 4. *A tower with its top in the heavens*, i. e. a very high tower: a common Orientaliſm. See Deut. 1. 28.—9. 1.—When Sultan Mahmud Gaznavi inveſted Canouge in the year 1000, he is ſaid to have ſeen a city, which raiſed its head to the firmament. See Pheriſhta, vol. 1. p. 22. quoted by Maurice, vol. 1. p. 43.

Ib. *Let us make for ourſelves a name-place* נעשה לנו שם. Of the various interpretations of this paſſage, I prefer that of Le Clerc. The hitherto ſcattered inhabitants of the earth wiſhed to have ſome permanent ſettlement; ſome centrical town, or metropolis, to which in caſe of danger they might reſort from the ſurrounding paſturages, whither they might have occaſion to lead their herds and flocks: a place, in ſhort, bearing their *name*. The Greek tranſlators render literally ποιησωμεν ἑαυτοις ονομα· and ſo equivalently the other antient verſions, even the Greek of Venice: which has been generally underſtood to ſignify, *Let us make ourſelves famous:* or, as the Latin Vulg. *celebremus nomen noſtrum*. But this explanation is hardly ſuitable to the context, even if פן could bear to be rendered προ, *antequam*, *before*, as it is rendered in Sep. and Vulg. If they only meant to leave a monument behind them, *before* their diſperſion; what need was there for a miracle to diſperſe them? It is plain that they meant to ſtick together, and to erect this city and tower as the centre of their union. The Thargumiſt Jonathan Ben-Uziel took שם to be an idol, placed on the top of the tower or pyramid; and this abſurd idea has been adopted by Faber in his *Archæologia Hebræorum*. Perizonius tranſlates שם by *ſignum*, a *ſign*, *mark* or *monument* to be ſeen at a great diſtance; and proper for recalling the vagabond hordes to their principal place of reſidence. That שם may denote a monument, is pretty clear from its Greek derivative σημα. See Strabo on the monument of Alexander, p. 794. edit. Paris.—This comes to the ſame purpoſe with Le Clerc's and my tranſlation: although I cannot think with Le Clerc that שם is here for עם.

Ver. 5. *But the Lord, having deſcended*, &c. This deſcent of the Lord, and his conſequent monologue, are nothing more, in my opinion, than a Hebrew mode of expreſſion, denoting that God's will was the cauſe of the diſperſion of mankind from Babel, and of the variety of languages which is then ſuppoſed to have taken place. The interpretation of thoſe, who imagine that no difference took place in language, but merely in opinion; which made the builders fall out with one another; is a forced interpretation *.—What Eupolemus and Abydenus ſay of this famous tower, may be ſeen in Euſeb. *Prepar. Evangel.* l. 9. and the fooliſh ſtories about its height, in Calmet's Commentary; or in his Dictionary.

Ver. 13. *Cainan*. See the Remarks on chap. 10. ver. 24.

* See Perizon. Orig. Babyl. c. 9.

Ver.

Ver. 29. *The father of both Melcha and Iſcha.* Why Iſcha is here mentioned, or who ſhe was, has puzzled interpreters. It is a very unimportant queſtion. Ephræm takes *Iſcha* to be the ſame with *Sarai*; who was ſo called on account of her beauty. *Iſcha* has that meaning only in the Syr. dialect; and may have been the firſt name of *Sarai*; before ſhe left Chaldea.

Ver. 31. The preſent Hebrew Text is here doubly deficient. I have ſupplied both chaſms from Sam. and partly from Sep. In my Various Readings I have mentioned only one copy of Sep. (namely Cott.) as containing the addition, *and Nahor.* I now find this addition in 23 of Holmes's MSS.—and 8 MSS. have υἱους αυτȣ inſtead of υἱον αυτȣ, correſponding likewiſe with Sam. Chryſoſtom read in his copy τους υἱους αυτȣ. The Armen. verſion repeats ſon in the ſingular, *Abram his ſon and Nachor his ſon.* See Holmes's Septuagint.—The addition of *and Melcha,* which has been omitted to be marked among my Various Readings, is only in Sam.: but when it is conſidered that Nahor's family ſettled in Phadan-Aram, where Tharah took up his reſidence; and that there is no reaſon to imagine, he would leave any of his family behind, the reading of Sam. muſt, I think, be admitted as the only true and full reading.

Ib. *Brought them out,* &c. The preſent Text has יצאו אתם, which our Engliſh tranſlators render: *They went forth with them*; a disjointed ungrammatical ſentence: for what is the antecedent to יצאו? Or who are *they,* who went forth *with them?* Did Tharah, Abram, Lot, &c. go forth with themſelves? The Arabic tranſlator, Saadias, ſaw the abſurdity of this; and, in order to heal the evil, foiſted in a word קום *populus, cœtus*; which the Latin tranſlator renders *aliquot homines.*—How much better the Syr. who muſt have read יצא in the ſing. "He (that is Tharah) went out with them."—But ſtill better is the reading of Sam. Sep. Vulg. יוצא, or rather יוציא *, εξηγαγεν, *eduxit.*

Ver. 32. *Haran.* In our common verſion this proper name is ſpelled in the ſame manner as Tharah's youngeſt ſon Aran: hence ſome have ſuppoſed that he gave his name to the place. But in Hebr. the ſon of Tharah is written with an ה, and the place Haran with an ח.

Ib. *One hundred and forty-five years.* I follow the Sam. reading, which is alſo that of Luke, Act. 7. 4. and reconciles the text of Geneſis with chronology. The preſent reading is 205. This various lection ſhould have been inſerted among Various Readings, vol. 1.

CHAP. XII.

Ver. 3. *ALL the human kind.* כל משפחות האדמה Lit. "All the families of the ground." This is ſuppoſed by commentators to refer to the Chriſtian diſpenſation: and the genealogiſt in Matthew's goſpel muſt have had it in view; in calling JESUS the ſon of ABRAHAM.—Dawſon paraphraſes thus: "Thou ſhalt be proclaimed bleſſed by all nations around thee—all the "families of the earth ſhall bleſs themſelves in thee—ſhall wiſh to themſelves and friends a "proſperity like thine." It is certain that *all the earth, all the ground,* and ſuch-like terms, imply not always abſolute univerſality, in the Hebrew idiom, or indeed in any other language.

* For ſuch is the genuine Sam. reading, as it is in 4 MSS.

All

All the world, in the mouth of an Engliſhman, is ſeldom *orbis terrarum*: it is often a limited world indeed. So that, in ſtrict phraſeological propriety, *all the families of the ground* may mean no more than thoſe extenſive regions where the name of Abraham was known, and revered. But ſurely his fame has been much more widely circulated through his SON JESUS CHRIST. The benediction therefore, prophetical or not, may juſtly be applied to him. For the reſt, I have rendered the Hebrew words by *all the human kind*, not from partiality to any ſyſtem; but becauſe I think it ſhould be the endeavour of every tranſlator to retain, if poſſible, ſomewhat of the preciſe and diſtinctive meaning of the original term:—for *human* has the ſame relation to אדמה as *earthly* has to אדם.—Dathe's verſion is: "Omnes terræ nationes per te erunt felices."

Ver. 6. *The Chanaanites were then in the land.* This has been urged as *one* proof, that this hiſtory was written after the expulſion of the Chanaanites: and this, I think, muſt be granted; or the comma conſidered as an addition by ſome poſterior ſcribe. Yet it ſeems to come in ſo naturally, as a part of the original narrative, that it is hard to diſcern the hand of an interpolator. Some modern interpreters have attempted to elude the objection, by giving a meaning to the word אז, and a turn to the ſentence, which, in my opinion, they cannot bear. They render אז by *jam tum, already*; and fancy that the hiſtorian meant to ſay: "The Chanaanites "were already in poſſeſſion of the land." So Dathe: *Chanaanitæ, vero, jam tum terram occupârant.* That is, they had driven out its aboriginal inhabitants, who were Arabian *Scenites* or *Nomades* from the Red-ſea: and therefore, ſays Roſenmüller, the poſterity of the *Scenites*, under Joſhuah, had a right to re-claim and re-conquer their own country: "Ergo Scenitarum "poſteri, ſub Joſua, omni jure patriam ſuam repetere potuerunt."—But I ſhould wiſh to know where it is recorded, that the Arabian Scenites were driven out of Chanaan by the Chanaanites: and, then, by what claim of priority the offſpring of Abraham (who ſurely were not the aborigines) had a right to recover a country which never belonged to their anceſtors. For, what connection had the nomadical tribes of Iſrael with Arabian Scenites; who themſelves are, without a proof, ſuppoſed to have been expelled by the Chanaanites? Truly, this is a ſtrange mode of reaſoning.

Ib. *The turpentine-tree of Moreh.* אלון מורה. The Sam. copy has מורא; which in Sam. verſ. is rendered חזבה *viſion*; as אלון is rendered מישר *the vale*. *The vale of viſion.*—Sep. την δρυν την ὑψηλην * *the lofty oak*. They are ſuppoſed by Schulze to have read מרום for מרה. I rather think that they had before them the Sam. reading; although they rendered not ſo literally as they might have done.—Jerom alſo ſeems to have read מורא, ſince he renders it by *illuſtrem, ad convallem illuſtrem*. Onk. Tharg. Jeruſ. and Arab. Erp. have *the plain of Moreh:* and in this they have been followed by moſt modern tranſlators †. Yet I very much doubt if ever אלון ſignify a *plain*; whereas it certainly ſignifies a tree of ſome ſort or other ‡: and it is my fixt opinion that it is that ſpecies of the oak called *terebinthus*, or the turpentine-tree, which lives to a very great age; and ſeems to have been held in as great veneration in the Eaſt, as the common oak was among the Greeks, Romans, Germans, Gauls and Britons. With re-

* The Greek of Venice has likewiſe της δρυος; but makes מורה a proper name. † In our common Engliſh verſion *oak* is the marginal reading; adopted by Bate and Purver. Pagninus has alſo *quercum*. ‡ See Iſa. 44. 14. Ezek. 27. 6. Hoſ. 4. 13. Am. 2. 9. in all which places our common verſion has *oak* or *oaks*. Some tranſlators, from a ſimilarity of ſound, have rendered אלון *alnus*, the alder-tree.

ſpect

ſpect to the word מורה I take it for a proper name, and have followed the preſent Hebr. reading. I have only to add, that Syr. and Arab. Pol. read ממרא; as if this were the ſame tree that is mentioned in the 18th verſe of next chapter. But that tree was by Hebron; this by Sichem.

Ver. 13. *Thou art my ſiſter.* אחותי את. But Sep. αδελφη αυτου ειμι. *I am his ſiſter.* And ſo alſo Syr. חתה אנא. They read אחתו אני *Soror ejus ego:* and this reading is perfectly congenial with the Hebrew idiom. Yet all the Hebr. and Sam. MSS. and the other verſions agree with the text. The ſenſe is all the ſame.

CHAP. XIII.

Ver. 1. *INTO the ſouth,* &c. הנגבה by Sep. rendered εις την ερημον, which is, perhaps, the original meaning of the word: but uſed from its poſition with reſpect to Judæa to denote the *ſouth,* as ים *the ſea* was uſed to denote the *weſt.* Houbigant is here unjuſt to the Vulgate, and ſtill more ſo to Le Clerc.

Ver. 2. *Rich in cattle.* במקנה. Although *cattle* was no doubt the principal poſſeſſion of Abram, yet the word comprehends every other acquiſition, *ſlaves, ſubſtance, tents,* &c. The preſent Vulgate has here a reading different from all the others. *In poſſeſſione auri et argenti,* "in the poſſeſſion of gold and ſilver." This cannot be of Jerom, who in Q. Heb. tranſlates *in pecore, et argento et auro.* Perhaps the original reading of Vulg. was *in poſſeſſione, argento et auro.* For the reſt, the word *Abram,* which is wanting in Clement's edition, was in 6 of Hentenius's MSS. and in the copy of Rabanus Maurus.

Ver. 5. *Tents.* So the original and all the verſions; ſave Sep. of which the editions of Compl. Ald. the Alex. and 17 other MSS. with Chryſoſt. and the Armen. verſion have κτηνη inſtead of σκηναι, which is the reading of the Vatican edition. One of Holmes's MSS. has both, κτηνη και σκηναι.—It was a miſtake in Montfaucon to ſay that there is nothing in the Greek for the Hebrew ואן. The word προβατα correſponds with it. See Scharfenberg's *Animadverſiones.*

Ver. 6. *That together they could not dwell.* The Ald. and Rom. editions of Sep. repeat here the reading of the former comma και ουκ εχωρει αυτους ἡ γη, &c. But Cod. Alex. and three other MSS. have και εδυναντο: and 21 MSS. with Complut. * have ουκ ηδυναντο.

Ver. 10. *Like a divine paradiſe.* כגן יהוה. Lit. *a garden* or *paradiſe of the Lord.* The meaning is ſufficiently explained in the next comma: *like the land of Egypt,* i. e. a fat fertile ſoil, and watered occaſionally by the overflowings of the Jordan. Houbigant will have it, that the garden here alluded to is the primeval paradiſe of Adam; and too raſhly aſſerts, that the word יהוה is never found like אלהים as an augmentative. Had he forgotten or overlooked Pſ. 104. 16. where the cedars of Lebanon are *called the trees of the Lord?* Beſides, how are we ſure that the original reading here was not אלהים? All the copies of Sep. ſave one, have τυ Θεου, *of God;* and ſo has Syr.—not to mention both Arabs; who both ſeem ſometimes, the latter frequently, to have ſubſtituted the one word for the other, contrary to their originals. All the other

* Holmes claſſes Complut. with thoſe which have εδυναντο· but he was miſled by Bos, who is frequently an unſure guide.

verſions read יהוה; nor is there any variety of lection in either the Hebr. or Sam. copies. It is worth remarking, that, in the rendering of this verſe, almoſt all modern tranſlations lead to a wrong meaning from a faulty arrangement: making Zoar relate to the land of Egypt; whereas it is mentioned as the extremity of the plain of the Jordan. The reviſed French Geneva verſion has well expreſſed the meaning: "qui étoit, avant que l'Eternel eût détruit "Sodome et Gomorre, arroſée par tout juſqu'à ce que tu viennes en Tſoar." And, more elegantly, Houbigant: "Ea autem, priuſquam Sodomam Gomorrhamque Dominus deleret, "erat, quo itur Segor, tota irrigua," &c.

Ver. 11. *Eaſtward.* In the Hebrew it is מקדם *from the eaſt:* and ſo all the antient verſions, ſave Onkelos, Arab. Pol. and Perſ. But this is contrary to the topographical ſituation in which the two patriarchs then were. Hence, ſome critics have imagined that מ or מן may ſometimes ſignify *verſus, toward:* but of this, I find, they bring no ſatisfactory proofs. It is better then to ſuppoſe that the original reading was בקדם, or ſimply קדם, as Saadias ſeems to have read: as he renders אלי אלמשרק; or, with Onkelos, give to קדם another meaning בקמיתא; as if Lot had been *the firſt* to depart. In fact, Abram is ſaid, in the next verſe, to have remained where he was.—I have ſometimes thought that מקדם might be rendered *a prima luce: at early morn*; according to the meaning of the word in the Chald. and Sam. dialects: but I find no ſuch acceptation in pure Hebrew: which, however, is not an altogether ſufficient ground for rejecting its probability. The Perſic tranſlator appears to have underſtood his text, in a ſenſe little different from Onkelos.

Ver. 18. *Abram then proceeded.* The preſent Hebrew text has ויאהל אברם, which in our common tranſlation is rendered "and Abraham removed *his* tent." So Sep. αποσκηνωσας, and Vulg. *movens tabernaculum.* But אהל, I apprehend, never ſignifies to *unpitch*, or *remove a tent.* Hence the Arabic tranſlator was ſo embarraſſed, that he makes up the meaning thus: פרס אבראם מרחלה מרחלה he "pitched his tent, ſtation *after* ſtation, until he came, &c." Onkelos, the Thargums, the Perſic tranſlator, Arab. Erp. and Gr. Ven. have all words which ſignify to *pitch*, not to *remove* a tent.—This reading, then, muſt have been an early corruption of the Hebrew text: for a corruption I cannot help deeming it; and think the original reading was ויחל, which is ſtill the reading of 3, perhaps 4, Sam. MSS.; and which might be more eaſily changed into ואהל than the edited Sam. ילך, which, however, is no bad reading. It is remarkable that in one of Kennicott's MSS. [75] the writer ſeems to have ſome ſuch word as יחל before him: for thus he copies ויח ויאהל. Whence could he have that ויח, if there was no ſuch word, either in whole or in part, in his exemplar? ויחל ויבא makes not only a plain ſenſe, but is perfectly conſonant with the context. God had bidden Abram traverſe the whole land. He inſtantly begins his progreſs: *he began, and went.* So Gen. 9. 20. יחל ויטע. My tranſlation ſuits either of the two Sam. readings; and even the preſent Hebrew, if אהל be allowed to ſignify *decamp*, or *to remove a tent.*

Ib. *The turpentine tree of Mamreh, by Hebron.* It is clear that the two laſt words could not be written by Moſes: for the name of Hebron, in the time of Joſhuah, was Kirjath-Arbah. See Le Clerc.—For the reſt, there was, in the days of Joſephus, a terebinth of a very great ſize, about ſix furlongs from Hebron, which was ſuppoſed to be coeval with the creation. τερεβινθος μεγιστη, και φασι το δενδρον απο της κτισεως, μεχρι νυν, διαμενειν. De Bell. Jud. l. iv. c. 9. No. 17.

CHAP.

CHAP. XIV.

Ver. 1. *AMRAPHEL king of Shinar*, &c. It is not eaſy to determine the reſpective reſidences of theſe kings, or emirs: nor is it of much importance. Thoſe, who wiſh to ſee what is moſt probable concerning them, may conſult Bochart, Lightfoot, Spanheim, Michaëlis, &c: I ſhall only remark, that Jerom renders *Elazar* by *Pontus*; and *Goim* by *Gentium*, after Sep. And ſo Onk. Tharg. Arab. Perſ. and even the Gr. of Venice βασιλευς των εθνων. The deceaſed Mr. Street imagined, that *Thidal* might be commander in chief, and that the expreſſion מלך גוים might be equivalent to Homer's Αναξ ανδρων Αγαμεμνων. But in this expedition Chedorlaomer ſeems to have been the chief: the others were only his aſſociates.

Ver. 3. *In the plain of Siddim* בעמק שידים. The antient interpreters vary greatly in tranſlating theſe words. Sep. επι την φαραγγα την αλυκην *. Vulg. after Sym. and Theod. *ad vallem illuſtrem*; Onk. למישר חקליא; and ſo equivalently Arab. Pol. פי מרג אלחקול *in the mead-land fields*. And Arab. Erp. אלי מרג אלצעאן. The Syr. has לעומקא דסדומיא *in the vale of the Sodomites*. He ſeems to have read חסדם. Perſ. and Gr. Ven. retain the Hebrew word; which I have alſo done with our common verſion, Houbigant, Dathe, Michaëlis, &c.

Ver. 5. *Of Aſhtheroth-Carnaim* בעשתרת קרנים. So the Text and almoſt all the antient verſions. But Sep. Vat. and Syr. make Carnaim the name of a ſeparate place. Did they find a *vau* before קרנים? or did they ſupply one? The latter is more probable: as there is no variety of lection either in Sam. or Hebr., and as the *και* is wanting in 26 MSS. and in all the other editions.

Ib. *The Zuzites of Ham.* הזוזים בהם. So the preſent Text with a *hé* in בהם. but 7 Sam. MSS. have בחם with a *beth:* and this muſt have been the reading of Jerom's Hebr. copies. "Pro "BAEM, ſays he, pro quo dixerunt (70) εμαι αυτοις, hoc eſt *cum eis*, putaverunt ſcribi per HE, "ducti elementi ſimilitudine; quum per HETH ſcriptum ſit." Q. Hebr. The Vulgate, however, follows the reading of Sep.; but this is no proof, as Martianay will have it, that Jerom is not conſiſtent with himſelf †. It is only a proof that the Vulgate is not throughout the verſion of Jerom. Yet all the other verſions ſeem to have read חם, although in general they make it a proper name. The Sam. verſion has בלישה *in Liſha:* which is probably the ſame with ליש *Laiſh* of Jud. 18. 7. This name, which ſignifies *a Lion*, agrees well with its inhabitants זוזים, which ſignifies a brave lion-like people: rendered by Sep. εθνη ισχυρα. by Syr. עשינא. I have retained both names in their original form: but read בחם not בהם. It may be the ſame with חמת in Num. 13. 21. which in 3 Sam. MSS. is written with an ה. May not Onkelos andJ onathan have this in view, when for חם, or חם, they wrote המתא, or perhaps חמתא?

Ver. 6. *The Horites of the mountains of Seir.* בהרי שעיר. So reads Sam. followed by all the verſions; ſave Arab. Erp. who ſeems to have read either בחר, or בהרר with one of Kennicott's MSS. and the Gr. verſion of Venice, which follows the preſent reading בהררם εν τω σφων ορει; *in their own mountain.* Houbigant, Michaëlis, and Dathe all follow the Samaritan reading.

* For επι, 13 MSS. have εις; and for αλυκην, 3 MSS. with Compl. have αλικην. † "Non videtur Hiero- "nymus hîc ſibi ſatis conſtare, quia ipſemet in ſua Latina Tranſlatione Bibliorum legebat בהם *in eis*, vel *cum eis*."

Ver. 7. *All the low country.* את כל שדה, or rather את כל שדי, in the plural, as Onkelos and Jonathan muſt have read in their copies, with one of Kennicott's MSS. The Greek and Syriac tranſlators alſo read in the plural, not שדי indeed, but שרי *princes*, *τους αρχοντας*, רישנא, and this is no improbable reading. It was, perhaps, that of Saadias. But Arab. Erp. Perſ. and Gr. Ven. read שדה in the ſingular.

Ver. 9. *Four kings.* That is, the four laſt mentioned, againſt the five former. Hence Cod. Alex. has well rendered *τεσσαρες ουτοι βασιλεις*: *theſe four kings.*

Ver. 10. *Fell there.* יפלו שמה; or as Sam. יפלו שם. Houbigant, with Amama, Oleaſter, and others, imagined that שמה cannot mean *there*, but *into*. "Nam שמה habet motum. Narrat "Moſes eos quinque reges *in puteos* cecidiſſe, non autem *in pugnâ* cecidiſſe propè puteos. Ita "rem accepere Græci interpretes, *ενεπεσαν* * *εκει*, *incederunt illuc.*" There is great good ſenſe in this obſervation; and I had once, myſelf, ſo tranſlated; not ſo much from the ſuppoſed ſignification of שמה, which has often the ſame meaning with ſimple שם, the Sam. lection, but becauſe the king of Sodom, who is here ſaid to be one of thoſe who fell, is, ver. 17. alive, and meets Abram. But, on further reflection, I now think that the preſent verſion, *there*, may be juſtified. The kings are ſaid to *fall*, when they are defeated: and we are juſt after told that a part eſcaped.—Yet ſtill I balance between the two interpretations.

Ver. 12. *All his riches.* כל רכושו. The firſt word is only in the Sam. text and verſion, as I have marked it in Various Readings. There is a ſeeming tranſpoſition of the words of this whole verſe, noticed by Houbigant; who would thus arrange them. ויקחו את לוט' בן אחי אברם' ואת כל רכושו' וילכו. He ſhould have gone further, I think, and inſerted והוא יושב בסדם either after לוט, or before וילכו. But although it muſt be allowed, that this order is more natural, I would not poſitively affirm it to be the original one. The preſent text, although embarraſſed, is clear enough to be properly underſtood. The difference of arrangement in Sep. and Syr. may not be owing to a difference in their copies from the preſent Hebrew. The Genevans, Diodati, and even our Engliſh tranſlators make a ſtill greater change in their reſpective arrangements: although they certainly found the original as it now ſtands.—That the critical reader may not imagine, that I have, in my verſion, omitted the ſecond וילכו, he is deſired to obſerve that, although ſeemingly redundant, it is however fairly included in the words "they "took *away* with them."—Were I allowed, indeed, to make a very natural and ſlight alteration in the Text, I ſhould be very much inclined to place וילכו after סדם, and make it the beginning of next verſe: "When they were gone," &c.

Ver. 14. *He muſtered.* With Houbigant, I follow the Sam. reading ידק, not ירק the reading of the preſent Hebrew, out of which philology has hardly been able to ſqueeze a tolerable meaning. Hear only Roſenmüller: "ריק, quod propriè denotat *vacuum eſſe*, et in Hiphil *va-* "*cuum eſſe fecit*, *eduxit*, *expromſit*; hoc loco *armare* ſignificat; quia arma depromuntur ex ar- "mamentariis vel thecis, ſi milites ad prælium educuntur." If this interpretation ſatisfy the critics, I am content: but I am much better pleaſed with the Sam. reading; which, in all probability, was that of Sep. who render *ηριθμησε*, *he numbered*. So Vulg. *numeravit*. So Arab. Erp. עדד †: and ſo, I think, the Perſic verſion ought to be underſtood. What was read by the other tranſlators, it is hard to ſay. They ſeem to have gueſſed at a meaning, that ſhould

* Sixteen MSS. have *ενεπεσον*.

† Not עד, as Houbigant has tranſcribed.

be

be ſuitable to the context—except Gr. Ven. who certainly read ירק, and literally renders it εκενωσεν.—The Sam. reading דיק then appears, to me, to be the true reading. The verb דוק in Chaldee ſignifies to *make a diligent review*, to *ſuppute with accuracy*; in a word, *to muſter*; and it ſeems to have a ſimilar meaning in both the Syr. and Arab. dialects.

Ib. *His tried domeſtics.* את חניכיו ילידי ביתו. It is not eaſy to aſcertain the radical meaning of חנך. It occurs but 18 times, in any form, in Hebrew Scripture: and, in moſt of theſe places, ſignifies to *initiate*, or ſome ſuch term. Nor is that ſignification here inept. Abram's domeſtics were *initiated* in the art of war: *tried* and *expert* in the uſe of arms. The antient verſions vary in their renderings, but they may be moſtly reconciled to this meaning. Sep. indeed, has ιδιους: but I ſuſpect this word has here a peculiar meaning, and ſignifies ſomewhat more than *ſuos* or *proprios*. It may have the ſame meaning with ικανους, or the Latin *idoneos*; of which, perhaps, it is the root. Be that as it may, the Latin Vulg. has *expeditos*, no improper term. Onkelos and Jonathan have a word, that is commonly rendered *juvenes*: but which I take to mean more than that; namely *juvenes, adultos, fortes, ad miniſterium aptos*; youths of a ſuperior ſort, robuſt expert young men *; or, as Jonathan well explains it, עולמוי דחניך לקרבא *youths, whom he had trained to war* †. To the ſame purport Saadias, נצחאה, *his truſty ones*. Arab. Erp. צביאנה (from צבא) *his military*. Perſ. האבראן *miniſters*. In fine, the Greek of Venice has the very word we want, εγκαινιστους αυτου.—So that, whatever be the radical meaning of the word, which I take to be *habena, a bridle*: not a bridle like our modern bridles: but a cord, halter, or *hank* ‡ tied about the heads of animals to train them to duty. Hence metaphorically, *to train* up men to any profeſſion.

Ver. 18. *Melchizedek, the king of Salem, brought forth bread and wine.* It is hardly conceivable that this paſſage, ſo ſimple, and readily underſtood, ſhould have given riſe to one of the moſt violent controverſies between the Proteſtants and the Romaniſts. The latter would have it that the bread and wine, brought forth by Melchizedek, were not for the refreſhment of Abram and his aſſociates; but a real ſacrifice offered to God, and an early type of the ſacrifice of the Maſs §. The Proteſtants, on the other hand, could ſee nothing of all this in the text, and indeed they had good reaſon: although the Catholics had the fathers, even Jerom himſelf, on their ſide. The reader, who chooſes to ſee how the controverſy was carried on, may conſult Bellarmine, Whitaker, Martin on the Douay Bible, Mercerus, Amama, &c. It is but juſt to obſerve, that ſeveral of the moſt learned Catholics even then gave up the point; ſuch as Cajetan, Andradius, Oleaſter: and now I believe there is hardly one who would ſeriouſly defend it. "Ideo (ſays Houbigant) Melchiſedech ſacerdos Dei altiſſimi nuncupatur, quia benedixit "Abrahamo; non quia panem et vinum protulit.—Ita rem accepit Paulus in Ep. ad Hebræos." See Joſephus, Ant. l. 1. c. 10. n. 2.

Ib. *Prieſt of God the ſupreme.* Although I have thus tranſlated, according to the import of the word עליון, it would, perhaps, have been more proper to leave the word untranſlated *the*

* See Buxtorf. Lex. Chald. † The Thargum of Jeruſalem has מרביצי: but Buxtorf ſhews that this is an error: and that the true reading is מרביני; which denotes more than mere domeſtics, it denotes *ſpecial ſelect well inſtructed ſervants*. ‡ This appears to me to be the very original word. § Their argument was drawn from the Vulgate verſion: which runs thus: "At vero Melchiſedech rex Salem, proferens panem et vinum, erat *enim* "ſacerdos Dei altiſſimi, benedixit ei," &c. The ſtreſs was laid on the word *enim*: which indeed ſhould have been *autem* or *et*. So Sep. ην δε ιερευς· and ſo all the other verſions.

God

God Elion; as I have little doubt of that being the name of Melchizedek's God, and probably of the people whoſe king he was: for he was, like Virgil's Annius, both king and prieſt, according to the uſage of antient times.

Ver. 19. *He bleſſed Abram.* I have omitted, it appears, to mark among my Various Readings that the word *Abram* is added on the authority of Sam. and Sep.*

Ver. 24. *Aner.* ענר. The Sam. copy has here and in ver. 13. Anram ענרם, and Sep. has Αυναν †. That *Aner* is the true reading appears from Joſephus; who has Ενηρος.

CHAP. XV.

Ver. 1. *IN a viſion.* Sep. Ald. and one of Holmes's MSS. add νυκτος, *of the night.*

Ib. *And very great ſhall be thy reward.* ושכרך הרבה מאד. I add the *vau* on the authority of 9 Sam. MSS. Vulg. and Armen.—The Sam. copy inſtead of הרבה has ארבה, "I will make thy "reward exceeding great," a reading of the ſame import, and almoſt equally probable.—That a tranſlator from the Latin Vulgate, unacquainted with or inattentive to the original, ſhould thus render: "I am thy protector and thy reward exceeding great," is not very ſtrange, as the ambiguity of the Latin phraſe admits that meaning; and ſo the Douay tranſlator renders it: but that our laſt Engliſh tranſlators ſhould have fallen into that miſtake, is not ſo eaſily accounted for; eſpecially as they had not only the Septuagint and other antient verſions, but prior Engliſh tranſlations to point out the right road. But they implicitly followed the Geneva and Biſhops' Bibles; and retained not, even in the margin, the better rendering of Tyndal, and Cranmer's Bible.—Even the Latin Vulg. itſelf, when properly pointed, is ſuſceptible of the true meaning. "Ego protector tuus: et merces tua magna nimis:" *erit* being underſtood.

Ver. 2. *Lord, God!* The preſent Text has אדני יהוה, *My lord the Lord*; or *My lord Jehovah.* I preferred the reading of Vulg. Syr. Onk. and 4 MSS. which have יהוה אלהים. But when I ſo tranſlated, I had not ſeen Dr. Holmes's Various Readings of the Septuagint; nor, at that moment, conſidered the impropriety of putting יהוה in the mouth of Abram, to whom, if we believe the Lord himſelf ſpeaking to Moſes ‡, the term was not known. I am now fully convinced, that the true original reading was, either ſimply אדני *my lord*; or אדני אלהים *my lord God.* It is true, the Septuagint have Δεσποτα Κυριε in all the printed editions, ſave that of Alcala: but Κυριε is wanting not only in this edition, but in not leſs than 24 of Holmes's MSS. and in the antient Coptic verſion. Nor was it read by Philo, Cyril of Alexandria, Chryſoſtom, Gennadius: and, what is ſtill more remarkable, it is wanting in the Greek of Venice; which has only δεσποτ' εμε. All this is in favour of אדני only.—Yet I am more inclined to think that אדני אלהים *my lord God* is the genuine reading: and this reading may have been that which Jerom and the Syriac tranſlator found in their copies: for the words Domine, מריא, are uſed by them to expreſs אדני as well as יהוה §. With reſpect to אלהים, it was read not only by Jerom, Syr. and Onk. but alſo by both Arabs. Tharg. and Perſ.; and is in one of Kenni-

* That is, of Sep. Vat. Ald. and Alex. for 4 of Holmes's MSS. have αυτον. And 1 MS. with Ed. Compl. have αυτον Μελχισεδεκ.

† Compl. only has Ανερ; not, as Holmes has it, Ανηρ. He was not here miſled by Bos, who quotes rightly.

‡ Exod. 6. 3.

§ See ch. 18. 3, 27, 30.

cott's

cott's MSS. without either יהוה or אדני. I desire my version to be corrected thus: *My lord God.*

Ib. *And he, to whom I must leave all, is that Damascene, Eleezer.* ובן משק ביתי הוא דמשק אליעזר. This is a very difficult passage, and has given much trouble to commentators. The great desideratum is to ascertain the true meaning of the word משק, which occurs but thrice in the Bible *, and begets obscurity every time it occurs: nor is it certain that in each of these places it is derived from the same root: and, indeed, the sense that might suit one passage, can hardly be made to suit another †. Here, therefore, we must be contented with collecting what rays of light we can from the context and the antient versions. In the most antient of these, the word is considered as a proper name, and the passage rendered thus: ὁ δε υἱος Μασεκ της οικογενης μου, ὁυτος Δαμασκος Ελιεζερ ‡. They supposed *Masek*, or *Mesek*, to be one of Abram's female domestics, whose son was destined to be his heir, in case he should have no children. The other Greek versions, supposed to be those of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion, are υἱος τυ τροφιζοντος—συγγενης—του επι· all vague conjectures. Onk. בר פרנסא, and Tharg. בן פרנסת. *filius sustentationis*, the man who provides for the house; and so equivalently Pers. and Arab. Erp. Vulg. *filius procuratoris*. Sam. version, בר מדבר *the man of business*, the *steward*. Saadias דו קאד *ipse regens*, to the same purport.—The Syriac translator either found not משק in his copy, or omitted to render it.—Finally, the Greek of Venice has this remarkable reading, υἱος της αἱρεσεως; which may be rendered *the son of election:* and if I could find in any of the oriental dialects a similar meaning in any of the following roots משק, נשק, שקק or שוק, I should without much hesitation prefer this version to all others.—But the truth is, all the antient translators seem to have made the best conjectures they could: and, perhaps, the Syrian did better to leave the word out altogether, than give it an uncertain meaning.

Let us now see how modern critics have disposed of it.—Those who derive the word from שקק, render it *filius cursitationis, the son of cursitation:* a proper appellation, say they, for a *steward*; who is constantly *running about* in the discharge of his duty.—Others derive it from the Arab. נסק, which signifies *to arrange*, or *set things in order*. Hence בן משק will be *the son of order*; or chief ruler of the house.—Others, making משק itself the root, and finding one signification of that word, in Arabic, to be *properare, to hasten*, imagine that בן משק may denote vir *properus* et *diligens*; a *diligent* steward, who goes *expeditiously* about his affairs.—Others, supposing that משק signifies *to leave*, interpret בן משק *filius relictionis*; i. e. he to whom the inheritance *is to be left*.—Although I am far from thinking, that this signification of the word is unquestionable, I have adopted it in my version; as the most agreeable to the context: for it seems clear from the tenor of Abram's speech, and the order of the Hebrew words, that בן משק ביתי signify something synonymous to an *heir*.—I once thought the true meaning of the word משק might be found in the Æthiopic *Shuk*; which denotes the *stay* or *support* of a house. This would certainly make a good sense here: but as it has no such meaning in any of the other sister dialects, I durst not admit it into my translation. I have taken no notice of Schultens's *pectinare*; because I think it an absurd derivation. On the whole, it is better to confess one's ignorance, than to affirm for certain, what is but barely probable.

* Namely, Is. 33. 4. and Zophan. 2. 9. and here. † See c. 2. on the respective places. ‡ The various readings, in Holmes, are here of no importance.

Ver.

Ver. 6. *Who accounted it to him for righteouſneſs.* ויחשבה לו צדקה; which Sep. and, from them, St. Paul render και ελογισθη αυτω εις δικαιοσυνην, *It was accounted to him*, &c. So alſo paſſively, Vulg. *reputatum eſt illi ad juſtitiam* *. I, with Arab. Perſ. Tharg. Pagninus, Caſtalio, and our common verſion, take the word actively; and have rendered accordingly. The meaning is well expreſſed by Saadias בתבהא לה חסנה, *he aſcribed it to him, a good deed.* He numbered it among the other teſts of his piety and religion.—This text has been a ſubject of much warm altercation between the Popiſh and Proteſtant controverſialiſts: in which the latter, in my opinion, were fairly worſted.

Ver. 9. *An heifer of three years*, &c. עגלה משלשת. Sep. δαμαλιν τριετιζουσαν. Vulg. *vaccam triennem:* and ſo all the antient verſions, ſave Onk. and Perſ. which, inſtead of a *three years old heifer*, have a *triple-heifer*, or *three heifers* †. And this is the interpretation of Sol. Ben Jarhi, D. Kimhi, and other Jewiſh commentators. "The Hebrew word משלש, ſays Delgado, "means *threefold*, as in Eccleſ. 4. 12. I do not know who informed the Engliſh tranſlator, "that they [the heifer, ſhe goat, and ram] were to be three years old, rather than three "months or three weeks." I will tell him who informed the Engliſh tranſlator, and every other tranſlator, who renders as he doth.—The Septuagint, who certainly knew the purport of the word better than Jarhi, Kimhi, or Delgado—the learned Jew Joſephus, who renders in the ſame manner—the Syr. and both Arabs, who were all well acquainted with the idiom of the Hebrew language—the Thargum of Jonathan, who expreſsly renders עגלה ברת חלת שנים—and the Text of Iſaiah 15. 5. where עגלת שלשיה cannot, certainly, mean *three heifers*, but one *full grown heifer of three years:* as the Thargum on that place well renders it.—But חחוט המשלש in Eccleſ. is a *triple cord.* True; but it is only *one cord*, compoſed of *three plies*, juſt as the heifer's age is made up of *three years.* The משלשות of Ezek. 42. 6. is to be underſtood in the ſame manner; a building *of three ſtories.* The animals here mentioned are, at three years, in the prime of their life, and then reputed perfectly fit for victims ‡.

Ver. 13. *Will reduce them into ſlavery.* Our tranſlators, following the reading of the preſent Text, render "and ſhall ſerve them." But, as Delgado well obſerves, the nominative here muſt be the people of the land in which they are to be ſtrangers, and the pronoun *them* אתם muſt refer to the *ſeed of Abram.* He thinks that עבדום is here עבדו בהם *they ſhall ſerve themſelves with them.* Why not rather העבידום, which, I have no doubt, was the original reading? Sep. δουλωσουσιν αυτες. Vulg. *Subjicient eos ſervituti.* Arab. יסתעבדונהם *ſhall enſlave them.* They all read in *Hiphil*, or the coäctive voice. And ſo equipollently, Syr. and the Thargums.

Ver. 15. *Shall have been buried in a good old age.* תקבר בשיבה טובה. Sep. τραφεις § εν γηρᾳ || καλῳ: a very early corruption, ſince it is in both the Italic and Coptic verſions; and what is

* So alſo Syr. and Onk. as tranſlated in the Polyglott: but that tranſlation, I think, is wrong; and both, as well as Tharg. ſhould be rendered actively. The Gr. of Ven. renders paſſively λελογισται τουτο οι δικαιοσυνην. † So alſo Gr. Ven. δαμαλιν τριπλην. ‡ I cannot here refrain from tranſcribing the excellent obſervation of Roſenmüller. "Ratio autem cur Deus animalia trima eſſe voluerit, ſine dubio hæc fuit, quia tali ætate hæc animalia in "pleno robore et vigore ætatis ſunt. Chryſoſtom. Hom. 26. in Geneſ. τρετιζοντα λαβειν προσεταξε, τουτ' εστι, τελεια "απηρτισμενα. Sic apud Lucian. in Deorum Dialogis, Ganymedes a Jove raptus, et demitti petens, pro λυτρῳ ſuo "promittit ſe Jovi immolaturum arietem τον τριετην, τον μαγαν, ὁς ἡγειται προς την νομην." § Three MSS. have τραφης. || Nineteen MSS. have γηρει.

very

very remarkable not one of Holmes's MSS. has the true reading of Compl. ταφεις. Excellent is the verſion of Aquila, ταφεις εν πολιϊ αγαθη. So alſo Gr. Ven. ταφηση τ' εν πολιϊ χρησῃ.

Ver. 18, 19. On the boundaries of Judæa, and every queſtion relative to the geography of that country, I ſhall copiouſly treat in my General Preface.

CHAP. XVI.

Ver. 12. "THIS verſe (ſays Delgado) in the Engliſh tranſlation is not intelligible:"—a ſtrange aſſertion. To me it is perfectly intelligible: and to every one, I preſume, it will appear more intelligible than that which he would ſubſtitute: "His hand ſhall be *in all*; and the hand of all ſhall be *in him*."—The verſion of Schulze, though not literal, is elegant and expreſſive: "omnium adverſarius, ab omnibus viciſſim infeſtabitur."

Ib. *In the face of all his brethren*, &c. The word *brother* in Hebrew denotes every kind of relation. By the mother's ſide, her Egyptian relations were his brothers; by the father's ſide, the poſterity of Abraham. To both the Iſhmaelites were conterminous. Hence his reſidence is ſaid to be *in the face of all his brethren*, על פני כל אחיו.—Dathe thinks the words על פני ſhould be rendered *ab oriente, to the eaſt* of all his brethren. I doubt, if the words will bear ſuch a verſion.

Ver. 13. *The viſible God*, &c. This is a very difficult paſſage, which various attempts have been made to elucidate. The preſent Hebrew runs thus, ותקרא שם יהוה הדבר אליה אתה אל ראי, which our tranſlators render: "And ſhe called the name of the Lord, that ſpake unto her, Thou God "ſeeſt me." Le Clerc and Houbigant conſider * ראי, not as the participle benoni; but as a verbal noun, and render *Tu es Deus viſionis*; i. e. *viſibilis*. So Michaëlis: "Du biſt der "Gott des ſehens." I underſtand ראי or ראה in the ſame ſenſe; but I divide the words thus† את האל ראי; making את the uſual mark of the accuſative, and ה the prefix to אל. I know not if Dathe ſo divided; but he has rendered as if he had. "Vocavit Jovam cum ea collo-"quentem, *Deum viſionis*."—This arrangement, and this tranſlation, are evidently more agreeable to the context; and have more of the Hebrew idiom in them than the preſent reading, and common rendering of the words.—But all the difficulty is not yet got over. The following words, explicative of the former, have, in my opinion, been generally miſunderſtood. They run thus in the Text: כי אמרה: הגם הלם ראיתי אחרי ראי which in our vulgar tranſlation is rendered: "For ſhe ſaid: Have I alſo here looked after him that ſeeth me?" which verſion if any one underſtand, I ſhall admire his acuteneſs. The Latin Vulgate has at leaſt an intelligible rendering: "Dixit enim: Profectò, hìc vidi poſteriora videntis me‡." He had, no doubt, in view a paſſage in Exod. 33. 23. where God is repreſented as ſhewing his *back only* to Moſes. The Septuagint either read not or diſregarded אחרי, unleſs we ſuppoſe that they expreſſed it by *ενωπιον*; which is not at all improbable: for אחר and אחרי not only ſignify *behind*, but *beſide, by*. And the Coptic verſion ſeems to have ſo underſtood the Greek. In this, then, I agree with them; and have willingly adopted their verſion, but interrogatively. Και

* The Sam. copy has ראה, which perhaps is the better reading. † Contrary, however, to all the antient verſions, who read אתה in one word. ‡ Thus engliſhed by the Douay tranſlators: "For ſhe ſaid: Verily here "have I ſeen the backe parts of him that hath ſeen me."

γαρ. ενωπιον [μου] ειδον οφθεντα μοι. I have added μου in brackets, becauſe I ſuſpect it was originally in Sep. as it is ſtill in the Copt. and in one of Holmes's Arab. MSS.

Ver. 14. *Wherefore the well was called The well of the viſible God.* Lit. the well of the God of viſion. I have here indulged an emendation partly conjectural. The preſent Text is: באר לחי ראי, which our tranſlators, in the margin, render "The well of him that liveth *and* ſeeth "me." So the Latin Vulg. "Puteum viventis et videntis me."—The verſion of Sep. at firſt ſight ſeems ſtrange: φρεαρ, ου ενωπιον ειδον. They ſeem to have again read אחרי inſtead of לחי; and to have underſtood אלהים God: "The well where I ſaw *God* beſide me." This is not amiſs: but it does not entirely ſatisfy me. I preſume then, that the true reading is באר אלהי ראי *The well of the viſible God:* conformable to verſe 13.—Cui hæc diſpliceant, is meliora inveniat.

CHAP. XVII.

Ver. 1. *GOD the omnipotent.* Although I have preferred this appellation; I am not quite ſure that it is the real meaning of the Hebrew word שדי: which ſome derive from the Chald. שדא to *ſhed*; becauſe God *ſheds* his bounties on man: and this is certainly no improper or improbable derivation. The *all-ſufficient* of the Arab. verſion is applicable to both attributes. The derivation of שדי from שדד is highly improbable. The Lord would not aſſume, at any time, a name that better ſuits *him* who is called the *deſtroyer*; much leſs at a time when he is encouraging his ſervant to look for his protection and favour. Ikenius, indeed, has endeavoured to ſhew that שדד, in Arabic at leaſt, ſignifies, *powerful, ſtrong:* and in this ſenſe it will be ſynonymous with omnipotent.—Michaëlis thought שדי came from the Arab. סדו *to mount up:* and is equivalent to επουρανιος.—It is obſervable that the word either was not read at all, by Sep. or that they omitted to render it. They have only εγω ειμι ὁ θεος σου. Is it probable that they read אלהיך? The Gr. of Venice has εγω θεος ὁ κραταιος.

Ver. 13. *Born in thy houſe, or purchaſed with thy money.* This diſtinction of ſlaves is clearly marked in Sophocles, Œd. Tyr. ver. 1143. ην δουλος. κ. τ. λ.—So our Chaucer: "Thine owne "*ſquire,* and eke thine own *born-man.*"

Ver. 14. It is rather odd, that the addition in Sep. "on the eighth day" is not found wanting in any one of Holmes's MSS. This, with Sam. copy, is much in favour of that reading.

Ver. 15. *Sarai—Sara.* I have ſaid in my explanatory note that *Sarai,* or rather *Sari,* appears to me to ſignify a *ſtar.* My reaſons are, 1. The prior name of *Sara,* namely *Sarai* or *Sari,* was moſt probably given to her in Syria: now סרי in Syriac ſignifies a *ſtar.* 2. We learn from the book of Job, chap. 42. ver. 14. that it was uſual in the Eaſt to give to beautiful women the names of ſtars. *Sarai* then was the *Aſteria* or *Stella* of her day. At leaſt, this is a much more probable etymon, than either the common one, which makes Sarai ſignify *My lady,* a title which, I believe, is unknown among the Orientaliſts; or Michaëlis's *colocynth,* which we can hardly ſuppoſe could ever be the name of the beautiful Sara. With reſpect to this latter new name I cannot but agree with Ikenius, that it is derived from the Arab. סרא, which denotes *fecundity.* The objection of Michaëlis to this etymon, from the *eliph,* in Arab., having a *hamza,* is a pitiful objection: there exiſted no hamzas in the days of Abraham.

Ver. 16. *Whom I will alſo bleſs.* וברכתיו. So Sam. Sep. and Syr. which I prefer to the preſent tautological reading ברכתיה.

CHAP.

CHAP. XVIII.

Ver. 8. *CREAM.* חמאה. So Raſhi explains it. שומן החלב *The fat of the milk.* I am not however certain, but it may rather mean that ſort of acid milk which the heat coagulates, and which is exceedingly cooling in the ſummer ſeaſon. That it was in ſome degree a potable liquid, is clear from Jud. 5. 25. where Jaël preſents it to Siſerah, to quench his thirſt. Abraham, then, brought to his gueſts either *cream* and *ſimple milk*, or *ſour* and *ſweet milk:* which mixt together, make, even in our climate, a very palatable diſh.

Ver. 10. *According to the time of life.* כעת חיה. Sep. κατα καιρον τουτον εις ὡρας. Vulg. *Tempore iſto, vita comite:* and ſimilar gueſs-work is in all the antient verſions. The beſt of thoſe conjectures appears, to me, that of the Perſic חון וקת זאהה *Juxta tempus fœtûs.* This is, I think, the true meaning. See my explanatory note.

Ver. 19. *For I know,* &c. The preſent Hebrew has, *I know him,* ידעתיו, which Houbigant renders *ego providi de eo*; and Michaëlis: "Ich habe ihn zum freunde erwählt;" *I have choſen him for a friend, that he may,* &c. This interpretation is adopted by Schulze and Roſenmüller: *Eum enim amicum elegi, ut præcipiat,* &c. "By this rendering (ſay they) the affix *vau* is ex-"preſſed, which it is not by the common tranſlation; and למען retains its ordinary and proper "acceptation." The former of theſe reaſonings is weakened by the Sam. lection ידעתי, without the affix; which was read by none of the antient verſions, ſave Perſ. Arab. Erp. and Gr. Ven.—There ſeems to be more force in the latter reaſoning, which is chiefly inſiſted on by Houbigant: "Neque aliam ſententiam capit למען אשר, in quo adverbio *cauſa* eſt rei futuræ, "non autem *nuda* ejus *expoſitio.*" So, indeed, the Erpenian Arab. ſeems to have underſtood his Text לאן שרפתה בסבב אלדי אמר: and it muſt be confeſſed that the general meaning of למען, with or without אשר, is *becauſe, to the end that*; nor have I found a ſingle paſſage, but the preſent one, in which it can well be otherwiſe rendered. The verb ידע has certainly a wider ſignification than merely to *know.* It often ſignifies to *acknowledge, approve, ſuperintend:* and it may have ſome ſuch meaning here; eſpecially if the preſent reading ידעתיו be accounted the genuine one. But if the other reading, ידעתי, which has for it the authority of Sam. Sep. Syr. Vulg. Onk. Tharg. and Arab. Pol. then I think we muſt give to למען אשר an uncommon meaning, and render, with the forementioned tranſlators, as I have done. So Dathe: "Novi enim, "eum præcepturum eſſe filiis ſuis et poſteris ſuis, ut inſtituta mea ſervent," &c.—For the reſt, the word *Abraham,* which I have inſerted from Sam. is alſo, I now find, the reading of 3 MSS. of Sep. and was read by Chryſoſtom in his copy.

Ver. 20, 21. What ſcholar, on reading theſe verſes, does not immediately call to mind theſe beautiful lines of Ovid:

> Contigerat noſtras infamia temporis aures;
> Quam cupiens falſam, ſummo delabor Olympo,
> Et Deus, humana luſtro ſub imagine terras.

CHAP. XIX.

Ver. 11. *THEY ſmote with ſuch blindneſs.* הכו בסנורים. Sep. *επαταξαν εν αορασιᾳ* *. The Hebrew word, which occurs only here, ſeems to me to be a compound from the Arab. סנא which ſignifies a *flaſh*, and of אור *light*. The blindneſs then was cauſed by a flaſh † of lightning; and might be only temporary. The Greek verſion is ſuſceptible of this meaning. The French verſion of Geneva is not improper: "Ils frapperent d'*eblouiſſement*."

Ver. 14. *Who had married his daughters,* לקחי בנותיו, which is commonly rendered *had betrothed his daughters.* But it is ארש, not לקח that ſignifies *to betroth:* and the Sep. have well rendered the latter by *τους ειληφοτας* ‡. This relates to other daughters of Lot, than thoſe after mentioned, ver. 15. who are ſaid to be thoſe two only who were then *preſent* with him.

Ver. 16. *As he ſtill lingered.* ויתמהמה. The Sep. ſeem to have read ſome other word; perhaps ויתהמהו from המה, which twice in the Pſalms is rendered by the ſame Greek word which they uſe here, *εταραχθησαν* § *they were troubled.* Yet in Pſ. 119. התמהמהתי is rendered, as here, *εταραχθην.* Had *ταραττω* or *ταρασσω* ever ſuch a meaning? Or is the Greek word here a corruption? I find no word in the language that could well be miſtaken for it; at any rate, the Text and all the other verſions have *lingered,* or ſomething equivalent. Lot was loth to leave Sodom, which he had choſen for his reſidence; and where he had probably made connections.

Ver. 20. What I have rendered "Is it not a ſmall city?" may ſignify "Is it not a ſmall "boon" *which I aſk?* But the other ſeems to be the better tranſlation.

Ver. 24. *When the Lord himſelf,* &c. Lit. *The Lord, from the Lord,* &c. יהוה מאת יהוה. This Hebraiſm has been a ſource of much ſcholaſtic diſputation. The great bulk of Chriſtian Theologues have imagined that two divine perſons are here mentioned. The firſt *Lord* is Jeſus Chriſt, who was one of the three angels who appeared to Abraham; and is now one of the two who were ſent to deſtroy Sodom and Gomorra; and who rains down from the ſecond *Lord,* that is from his *father,* fire and brimſtone on the Sodomites. It is rather aſtoniſhing, that even Houbigant and Michaëlis ſhould have gone into this ſyſtematical reverie.—This is one bad conſequence of ſervile tranſlations. If the Greek and Latin verſions had not literally rendered the original Κυριος, *παρα* Κυριου; *Dominus, a Domino*; we ſhould moſt probably never have heard of diſtinction of perſons. The Arabic tranſlator ſeems well to have underſtood his Text; as he renders ואללה אמטר עלי סדום כבריתא ונארא מן ענדה *God rained from himſelf ſulphureous flame,* &c.—Nothing is more common in the oriental languages, than to uſe the *noun* for the *pronoun:* and this indeed ſeems to be the language of nature. A child is not apt to ſay of himſelf, *I am a good boy*; but *Billy good boy*; or of his ſiſter, *Thou art a naughty girl,* but *Sally naughty girl:* and it is with ſome difficulty that he is made to underſtand, that *I* means himſelf, and THOU the perſon to whom he ſpeaks. A few examples from Scripture will, I apprehend, ſettle this matter Gen. 2. 3. "God bleſſed the ſeventh day, &c. becauſe on it he ceaſed from all

* Ald. and 33 MSS. want the prepoſition *εν* which, however, I am perſuaded ſtood originally in Sep. † Or rather by repeated flaſhes, for the word is in the plural; and rendered by Gr. Ven. *εν αορασιαις.* ‡ Moſt modern tranſlators, however, follow the Vulgate: *qui accepturi erant:* and ſo Joſephus underſtood the Text. The other verſions are ambiguous. § The only variety of lection, worth remarking, is that of 3 Arab. MSS. which read in the ſingular number.

"his

" his works which *he* (the Text has *God*) had ordained to create."—Exod. 16. 7. " Ye ſhall " ſee the glory of the Lord, on his hearing your murmurings againſt *him*"—the Text has " againſt *the Lord*."—Thus Joſh. 9. 21. " Let them live, ſaid the chiefs, as the *chiefs* (that " is *we*) have promiſed to them," &c.—1 Kings 2. 19. " Solomon cauſed a throne to be placed " for the *king*'s mother," that is, for *his own* mother.

I cannot quit the deſtruction of Sodom, and the deliverance of Lot, without a moſt apt quotation from Roſenmüller. " Mirum in modum huic noſtræ hiſtoriæ ſimilis eſt ea quam " Ovidius, lib. 8. Metam. de Philemone et Baucide narrat. Jupiter et Mercurius, ut hìc duo " angeli, inter homines humanâ formâ induti, iter faciunt—homines plane inhoſpitales " offendunt, ut inter Sodomitas nulla hoſpitum reverentia fuit—unus tamen Philemon Diis " peregrinantibus, ut Lotus angelis, hoſpitium præbuit. Tandem Jupiter et Mercurius deos " ſe fatentur, pœnaſque vicinis minantur, quod idem hìc faciunt duo angeli—Dii Philemonem " et Baucin eripiunt periculo, ut angeli Lotum et familiam—Servantur Philemon et Baucis " domum relinquendo, atque in montem, præeuntibus Diis, fugiendo; quemadmodum Lotus " et filiæ—Plectuntur, denique, vicini Philemonis et Baucidis, mutató in ſtagnum eorum " oppido; uti vallis Siddim lacus facta eſt—

———Tellus habitabilis olim,
Nunc celebres mergis fuliciſque paluſtribus undæ!

Ver. 26. To what I have ſaid in my explanatory note, I have only to add, that ſome modern interpreters are of opinion that the *ſaline ſtatue*, here mentioned, was a monument erected by poſterity to the memory of Lot's wife. This appears to me highly improbable. The tranſlation in my note is that of Dathe: " Uxor vero Loti, cum reſpiceret, in ſolo ſalſuginoſo " hæret infixa." He ſuppoſes that a ב may have dropt out of the text, before מלחה, from its contiguity to the ב at the end of נציב.

Verſes 31, 32, 33. Mar-Ephræm puts a curious apology in the mouth of Lot's daughters, on their pregnancy being diſcovered. They very gravely tell him, that the young men of Sodom, to whom they had been betrothed, had found means to get into their apartments, and had violated them, anteriourly to their leaving that city. The good Lot believed them, and was ſatisfied.

CHAP. XX.

Ver. 16. *LO! I have given,* &c. This has been always conſidered as a very difficult paſſage; and I long deſpaired of making any tolerable ſenſe of it. The preſent Text runs thus: הנה נתתי אלף כסף לאחיך· חנה הוא לך כסות עינים לכל אשר אתך ואת כל ונכחת, which our tranſlators render, " Behold, I have given thy brother a thouſand *pieces* of ſilver: behold, " he is to thee a covering of the eyes, unto all that *are* with thee, and with all *other:* thus " ſhe was reproved." To me this literal verſion is unintelligible; and is one of the many proofs which can be adduced, that the preſent Hebrew Text is incapable of being tranſlated into ſenſe, without being firſt corrected. Now it luckily happens that it is here, in part, cor-

rected

rected by the Sam. exemplar, הנה׳ נתתי אלף כסף לאחיך׳ הנה הוא ליך כסות עינים׳ ולכל אשר אתיך׳ ואת הכל ונותחת. This was partly the reading of Sep. who ſeem well to have underſtood the firſt part of the paſſage, Ιδου δεδωκα χιλια διδραγμα * τῳ αδελφῳ σου· ταυτα εςαι † σοι εις τιμην του ωροσωπου σου, και ωασαις ταις μετα σου· και ωαντα αληθευσον ‡. The whole of this verſion is clear: only they ſeem to have refined on the words כסות עינים, which they render τιμην ωροσωπου *the honour of the face*, i. e. a precious veil. In the laſt comma they are not ſo happy: for how out of ואת הכל ונוכחת, which is the Sam. reading, or even out of ואת כל ונתכחת, which is the Hebrew reading, they could draw και ωαντα αληθευσον, I cannot comprehend. They muſt have read, I think, ואת§ כל נתחת, which Syr. Vulg. Saad. and even the Thargums, alſo read; or ſuppreſſed the *vau* before נתחת. Yet ſtill, how will theſe words produce either the meaning of Sep. *and tell nothing but truth*; or Jerom's *et quocumque perrexeris, memento te deprehenſam*; or the wilder paraphraſes of Onkelos and Jonathan? Houbigant, who often finds corruptions in the Text where they are not, here maintains its integrity. "Nihil mendi eſt in voce ונכחת. Nos, "*ne te concupiſcant:* verbum pro verbo, *nam concupiſcibilis es*, ob tuam pulchritudinem; ex "נכח· Arabico verbo, *ducere uxorem, uti uxore*; vel *ejus matrimonium ambire.*" If poor Le Clerc had ventured ſuch a verſion, he would have been roughly handled for it by the Oratorian. Indeed it is altogether unworthy of Houbigant.

Michaëlis's verſion of the whole paſſage appears to me little leſs exceptionable. He derives כסות from כסס *numerare*, and renders כסות עינים *mulcta oculorum*; the *fine* which Abimelech paid for *looking* at Sara; and takes נכחת to be the ſec. perſ. fem. ſing. of the active voice of נכת, which, he thinks, is well rendered by Sep. αληθευειν. Then the לכל אשר אתך are to be diſjoined from what precedes, and united to what follows; and hence will ariſe the following verſion: "Lo! I have given to thy brother a thouſand ſhekels of ſilver, as an eye-fine: but to all "who are with thee, tell all the truth." I wonder that ſuch a verſion could be approved by Schulze and Roſenmüller. Michaëlis himſelf gives a much better one in his German tranſlation: "Ich habe deinem bruder tauſend ſeckel ſilbers zugeſtellet, für die kaufe einen ich-"leyer, und trage ihn überall, damit jedermann wiſſe, daſs du verkeyrathet biſt." So Dathe: "Dedi mille ſiclos argenteos fratri tuo, pro quibus velamen faciei tuæ emas, ut cum omnes "qui tecum ſunt, tum et alii, qui te viderint, intelligant te eſſe maritam." This free paraphraſe is perfectly intelligible: but I cannot think it the true meaning of the original, which I will now endeavour to give. I follow the reading of the Sam. copy, without the eliſion of a ſingle letter: I only change the *vau* before נכוחת into a *he* ||, which, from the great reſemblance of the two letters in the antient character, may have by tranſcribers been readily miſtaken for a *vau*. I next borrow from the Arabic the original meaning of נכח, which I believe to be *inire*; and נוכחת *fœmina inita*: one who is no more a virgin; or a *married perſon*, *maritata*. Then I think all will be clear, and the Text, thus divided and pointed, הנה נתתי אלף כסף לאחיך׳ הנה הוא ליך כסות עינים ולכ אשר אתך׳ ואת הכל הנוכחת will give the following

* Compl. and Alex. have διδραχμα (omitted by Holmes); and one MS. has διδραγματα. † One MS. has εσωσαν, but without σοι. ‡ One of Holmes's uncial MSS. has here a ſingular reading—και μεκετι ψευση το λοιπον. § Making את the fem. pronoun. || I think this better than throwing out the letter altogether; although that would make no odds as to the ſignification of the ſentence.

literal

literal verſion: "Ecce dedi mille argenti *ſiclos* fratri tuo: ecce, hoc *argentum* tibi velaminis "oculorum *ſit pretium*; et omni quæ tecum eſt; omni nempe maritatæ." This, I am perſuaded, is the genuine reading, and true meaning of this paſſage.—*Viderint eruditi.*

CHAP. XXI.

Ver. 14. *A BOTTLE of water.* I have retained the word *bottle*, although, with us, it gives a different idea. The antient bottles were made of ſkins, and contained more or leſs, according to the ſize of the animals (commonly goats) out of whoſe ſkins they were made. They are ſtill uſed in the Eaſt for carrying water and wine; and as they are carried on camels, equipoiſed on each ſide of the bearer, they are more convenient than any other: "Il vaut "mieux avoir le vin et l'eau dans des peaux de chevres, lorſqu'on voyage dans les païs orien- "taux. Le poil des peaux, qui contiennent l'eau, eſt en dehors; au lieu que celui des peaux, "qui contiennent le vin, eſt en dedans: et ces peaux ſont ſi bien poiſsées, que la liqueur ne "contracte pas le moindre mauvais goût." Niebuhr, Voyage en Arabie, vol. i. p. 171.

Ver. 19. *God opening her eyes*, &c. ſignifies only, according to the Hebrew phraſeology, that ſhe was fortunate enough to diſcover a well; which is no eaſy matter in thoſe deſerts, where wells are not plenteous, and are often ſo covered up as that none, but they who are acquainted with the places, can find them out.

Ver. 23. *My poſterity.* In the Hebrew are two words, לניני ולנכדי, which are rendered by Sep. σπερμα μου and ονομα μου, *my ſeed and my name.* Vulg. *poſteris meis ſtirpique meæ.* Syr. בטוהמי ובשרבתי. Onk. ובברי ולבר ברי, *to my ſon and ſon's ſon:* and ſo equivalently Jonathan. Perſ. Arab. Erp. followed by Pagninus, our Engliſh tranſlators, Le Clerc, Houbigant, and Dathe. But as the preciſe meaning of the original words * is not ſufficiently aſcertained, I have choſen to expreſs them both by the word *poſterity.* So Michaëlis: "Mit mir, und meinen nachkom- "men."

Ver. 27. *Took flocks and herds.* Houbigant here has committed an overſight: he renders, without any authority, *tulit ſeptem agnos et bovem.*

Ver. 31. *Beer-ſheba*, באר־שבע. שבע ſignifies both an *oath* and *ſeven.* Probably the oath was repeated ſeven times, according to the number of lambs. We are told by Niebuhr, (Deſcription de l'Arabie, p. 176.) that the Iman of Yemen confirmed his promiſe with *ſeven oaths.*

Ver. 33. *A tamariſk.* That אשל, Arab. اثل, ſignifies a tamariſk, is clearly ſhewn by Celſius, Hierobotan. part i. p. 537. See alſo Michaëlis's *Supplementa ad Lex. Hebr.*

* נכד ſeems to ſignify *a repreſentative.* נין *poſterity, ſoboles*, of any degree. The Greek of Venice has for the laſt word εγγονῳ.

CHAP.

CHAP. XXII.

Ver. 2. *THE land of Moria,* * ארץ המריה. Sam. has המוראה; and this ſeems to have been the reading of Aquila, Symmachus, Jerom, and even of Sep. although they render it by ὑψηλην, as they had before rendered a ſimilar word, ch. xii. 6. I am therefore inclined to think that this is the genuine reading; whether we conſider the word as an *appellative* or a *proper name*. As an appellative, it might be rendered *the land of viſion*; or, more properly, *a conſpicuous land*, as Aquila renders την γην την καταφανη. The Syr. interpreter took it to be the *land of the Amorites*. Onkelos, Tharg. Bab.† and both Arabs, render the Hebrew word by words that denote *worſhip, adoration, ſervice*, פולחנא, עבאדה. Moſt ſingular is the rendering of Gr. Ven. την γην Μοσχιτην.—On the whole, I deemed it better, with our vulgar tranſlation, Michaëlis and Dathe, to retain the original word, than to riſk a doubtful meaning, at beſt, and perhaps a falſe one.

Ver. 13. *He ſaw beſide him a ram.* I have ſaid in my explanatory note, that "perhaps the "Sam. Greek, and Syr. reading is the true one." I write this in the full conviction that it is the true one, or at leaſt a part of the true one; and that the word אחר, in the preſent Text, is either a corruption or out of its place.—The change from אחד to אחר was eaſily made. This latter reading, however, muſt have been in Jerom's copy, and in that of the Perſic tranſlator. But all the reſt, ‡ from Sep. down to the Greek of Venice, read אחד; and this is ſtill the reading of forty-two Hebrew MSS. of a very old edition without date, and of the ed. of Liſbon 1491, which, De Roſſi obſerves, is very accurate, and rarely departs from the Maſoretic readings. It is obſervable that Onk. and Saadias ſeem to have had both lections in their Text, as the former has בתר אלין *after* וחזא; as if he had read אחר after עיניו, and אחד, where אחר now ſtands, after איל. So Saadias has בעד דלך in the ſame place and meaning.—If אחר was ever in the Text, I would place it after והנה; and write, not אחר, but אחריו *beſide him*. In this ſuppoſition I have expreſſed, in my tranſlation, the meaning of both words; for *a* before *ram* is equivalent to *one*. I might have rendered איל אחד, more properly perhaps, *a ſingle ram*; prevented from following the flock, by being entangled in *a thicket* of brambles, or ſome ſuch ſhrub.

Ver. 14. *And Abraham called the name of that place* JEVE-IRAE, יהוה יראה, which the Maſoretes point thus יְהוָה יִרְאֶה, in our common tranſlation *Jehovah-Jireh*. This is of little importance: But how are the words to be rendered? The Septuagint have Κυριος ειδεν, (one MS. οιδεν): the Latin Vulgate, *Dominus videt:* Syr. מריא נחוא *the Lord will provide*; or, as we ſometimes ſay, *ſee to it*; and this, I doubt not, is the true meaning. The phraſe evidently alludes to the anſwer of Abraham, ver. 8. "God will *provide* for himſelf a victim," &c. It was ſo underſtood

* One of Kenn. MSS. has המוריה, and the Perſic tranſlator muſt have read the word with a *vau*, as he has retained the very name ſo ſpelled. † Tharg. Jeruſ. has למור מוריה *on Mount Moria:* and ſome modern interpreters are of opinion that *Mount Moria*, on which Solomon's Temple was built, is here proleptically to be underſtood. ‡ The word, indeed, is not expreſſed in either of the Arabs, probably becauſe they deemed it an expletive: but it is fully expreſſed by Sep. and Gr. Ven. κριος εις. Syr. and Jon. דכרא חד. Onk. דכרא חדא. It is worth remarking, as corroborative of the Sam. reading, that there is a ſimilar expreſſion in Daniel viii. 3. "I raiſed mine eyes; when lo! I ſaw, ſtanding by the river, *a ram*, איל אחד.

by

by Arab. Erp. who renders יראה אללה ; and ſtill better by Gr. Ven. Ὁ Ονριωης οφεται *. It is ſtrange that the Septuagint, who, in the verſe juſt mentioned, had uſed the ſame word οφεται, ſhould have here uſed ειδεν and ſtill more ſtrange that, in the laſt colon of ver. 15. they ſhould have rendered the ſame word paſſively οφθη. Yet in this they have been followed by Pagninus and moſt modern tranſlators, *In monte Dominus videbitur*. Some, among whom our laſt tranſlators, put the word יהוה in conſtruction, and render, "In the mount of the Lord *it* ſhall be "ſeen." What meaning they annexed to ſuch a ſentence I am at a loſs to know. Delgado tried to mend it thus: "*Concerning which place it will ſome day be ſaid*, In the mountain of the "Lord, *the Lord ſhall appear* †." Houbigant ſeems to have been guided by a ſomewhat ſimilar fancy. He imagines, that God here ſhewed to Abraham his ſon Jeſus Chriſt, who was to be the future victim for the world: "and this is what Abraham conſecrates to eternal memory, "when he ſubjoins, *To-day in the mountain the Lord ſhall be ſeen: Hodie in monte Dominus vide-* "*bitur:* illud *hodie* ſic accipiens, ut accipit Paulus apoſtolus illud Davidis, *Hodie ſi vocem ejus* "*audieritis:* quod hodie tamdiu durat, quamdiu ſæcula illa durabunt, de quibus apoſtolus, "*donec hodie cognominatur*. Propterea, Abraham non dicit, Hodie Dominus videtur. Nam "id ſpectaculum nunc ſolus videt Abraham, poſtea omnes viſuri ſunt, et ad omnes pertinebit "iſtud *videbitur*, generatim dictum, cum omnes unigenitum *in monte* viderint generis humani "victimam factam. Nec aliam ſententiam ſeries verborum patitur. Ex qua ſerie illi deviant, "qui hæc verba אשר יאמר היום Moſi ſic narranti attribuunt; quaſi renarret Moſes uſurpatum "ſua ætate proverbium. Nam, ſi ſic erit, non jam docebit Abraham, cur huic loco nomen "fecerit, *Dominus videbitur*, quam tamen nominum notationem in ſacris paginis non omittunt "ii, quicunque nomina rebus imponunt. Quod contra planè docebit Abraham, ſi de eo Moſes "ſic narrat, *Vocavit nomen loci hujus, Deus videbitur: nam dixit, In monte Deus videbitur*."—I have given the whole paſſage in the words of the author, for the purpoſe of exhibiting one of the firſt biblical critics of the preſent age, ſupporting an inſupportable verſion by a tiſſue of as bad reaſoning as I have ever met with. He would have here done well to pay ſome attention to Le Clerc, who has very properly rendered the firſt comma, although he miſtook the meaning of the ſecond; which is juſtly rendered by Jerom ‡, Gr. Ven. §, and our tranſlator Coverdale: "Upon the mountain ſhall [will] the Lord provide." For in this I agree with Houbigant that, in both commas, יראה ſhould be pointed and rendered in the ſame manner; that is, not in the future paſſive, but in the future active.—I will juſt mention Dr. Kennicott's tranſlation, for

* So alſo the Perſic tranſlator. Onkelos, Jonathan and Saadias have here wild conjectural paraphraſes. How Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion rendered, we know not. † "It moſt likely refers (ſays he) to the *Sche-* "*hinah* in the holy temple upon mount Zion, which is this very mountain. The word היום means ſome day. See "Job 1. 6. 13. and 2. 1. It can never mean, as the Engliſh tranſlator renders it, *as it is ſaid to this day;* for this was "not ſaid until David's time: ſo that we are not obliged to allow that an interpolation was made, in David's time, of "theſe words, as Aben Ezra pretends." This is a rare way of getting rid of an interpolation. But, in truth, there is no neceſſity to ſay with Aben Ezra, that there is here any interpolation. It may be a part of the original narrative, whether written by Moſes or any other perſon; or at any time poſterior to the tranſaction recorded. An expreſſion may become proverbial during the life-time, even, of him who firſt uttered it: but that is not a proof of the narrator's having lived ſoon after, or long after, that period. All that we can lawfully infer from the Text is, that theſe words, *In the mountain the Lord will provide*, had become a proverbial ſaying when the author wrote. ‡ *In monte Dominus videbit.* § Εν ορει ὁ ονρωης οφεται.

the ſake of Secker's note on it. " Kennicott (ſays he) tranſlates: *Becauſe he had ſaid, that* " *day, On the mountain the Lord will provide:* but, then, I think it ſhould have been אמר, " (not יאמר;) and I doubt whether היום ſingly do not always ſignify *this day*. The comma " might be tranſlated thus: *which is ſaid at this day: On the mountain*, &c. or, *as it is ſaid:* " for אשר is ſometimes put for כאשר. יראה might be paſſive; but אלוהים יראה, ver. 8. directs " to the other ſenſe."

CHAP. XXIII.

Ver. 1. I HAVE ſaid, in my Explan. Note, that the parentheſis שני חיי שרה *for ſo many years did Sara live*, is in all the antient verſions ſave Sep. and Vulg. I now find it is in 2 of Holmes's MSS. one of which is in uncial letters. Still I am inclined to deem it an interpolation; or, perhaps, originally a marginal notice, which afterwards crept into the Text.

Ver. 2. The addition in Sam. and Sep. (*in the valley*) is marked with an obelos in one of Holmes's uncial MSS.; and Jerom, Quæſt. Hebr. ſays, " Hoc quod hic poſitum eſt, *quæ eſt in* " *valle*, in authenticis codicibus non habetur *."

Ver. 10. *Ephron, who was then ſitting*, &c. So the late Bp. Law in his manuſcript notes, and Ainſworth and Purver in their verſions: and ſo, long before them, Sep. εκαθητο· and indeed, equivalently, all the antient verſions, ſave Vulg. which has *habitabat, dwelt*; followed by James's tranſlators, and retained by Bate.

CHAP. XXIV.

Ver. 4. *BUT that thou wilt go to my own country*, &c. כי אל ארצי. The Jewiſh interpreters tell us that כי is here for כי אם. But the Sam. copy and more than twenty MSS. have כי אם, which, undoubtedly, is the true reading.

Ver. 9. *Under the thigh of his maſter Abraham.* תחת ירך אברהם אדניו, where, according to ſome critics, אדני is in the plural. I think not; but believe it to be in the ſingular, with the affix; as אבי is often uſed; as if we were to ſay, *his my-lord*; *his my-father*.

Ver. 22. *A golden pendant.* נזם זהב. I have not tranſlated נזם by *ear-ring* or *noſe-ring*, but rather by a more generical term which may ſuit both. And, indeed, I believe it to have been rather a jewel hanging by the noſe, than in the noſe. Hence it was well rendered by Symmachus επεχεσιον, as we learn from Jerom †, who adds, that although the other interpreters rendered it by *inaurem*, yet by that word is not meant ear-rings, properly ſo called, but circular pendants made in the form of ear-rings. " Non quò in aures ponantur in naribus, quæ ex eo " quod de auribus pendeant inaures vocantur: ſed quò circulus in ſimilitudinem factus in- " aurium, eodem vocabulo nuncupetur: et uſque hodie inter cætera ornamenta mulierum, " ſolent aurei circuli in os ex fronte pendere, et imminere naribus." At this day the women

* Houbigant wrongly aſſerts, that the Complutenſian edition has not the words in queſtion. It has the very ſame reading as the other editions; ἡ ἐστιν ἐν τῷ κοιλωματι. So alſo the Coptic verſion, and the Lat. Italic, in Auſtin: and, indeed, I am much inclined to think that it was originally in the Hebrew Text; eſpecially as it is ſtill in the Samaritan copies. † In Ezek. 16. 12. tom. iii. p. 790, ed. Ben.

of

of Arabia wear ſuch pendants *. It is true that ſome women, particularly in Perſia, wore rings in their noſes, which for that purpoſe they pierced with a needle, as the curious reader may ſee in *Thevenot*, *Arvieux*, *Niebuhr*, *Pietro de la Valle*, *Ruſſel's Aleppo*, &c. Still I thought it better here to uſe a more general term, which might ſuit either, *face*, or *noſe*, or *ear*.

Ver. 26. *The man fell down.* This, I now think, is not a juſt rendering. The common verſion, *he bowed down his head*, or rather, *he bowed his head*, ſeems better to expreſs the meaning of יקד; although by ſome of the antient tranſlators it was conſidered as equivalent to our *proſtrate*. In my explanatory note, I have obſerved that the Septuagint ſeem to have read a different word, as they render ευδοκησας †. I am now of opinion that they read as we do, but gave to the word a tralatitious meaning; and that their ευδοκησας ſhould be rendered, not *bleſſing*, but *being well pleaſed* ‡, which Abraham's ſervant ſhewed by an inclination of his head: as we ſay, *to nod aſſent, approbation, complacency*.

Ver. 30. The tranſpoſition of the words *Haran*, &c. is thus defended by Houbigant: "Hæc "verba in verſum rejicimus ſequentem, eò quod hæc ſequuntur *accidit autem, cum videret*, &c. "quæ videre non potuit Laban, ſi jam foras exierat. Neque licet credere, Laban foras antea "exiiſſe, quàm ſorore ex ſua didiciſſet ea, quæ verſu 30. narrantur. Atque eum narrandi or-"dinem eſſe præpoſterum, docet illud וידי, quod rerum ſeriem ſolet indicare in narrando talem, "qualis fuit ipſe ordo rerum geſtarum."—Delgado has endeavoured to reconcile the preſent arrangement by rendering the verbs in the preter-perfect tenſe. "When he *had ſeen*—and *had heard*," &c. And ſo Dathe, *cum audiſſet—et vidiſſet*. But ſtill this is awkward in Engliſh; and all is made clear by the tranſpoſition.

Ver. 32. *He brought the man*, &c. I have followed the reading of the Vulgate, which ariſes from a different pronunciation of the word יבא, which is here, I think with Dathe, in the *co-active* voice. The other rendering, although that of almoſt all the verſions, is not near ſo natural, nor ſo agreeable to the context. It may, however, be defended on this principle, that the Hebrew writers are not always ſo accurate in their connection of the various parts of a ſentence, as that each verb has the ſame nominative.

Ver. 50. *Laban and Bethuel anſwered.* This is the firſt time that Bethuel is introduced. All had hitherto been tranſacted by Laban. Hence ſome have imagined that Bethuel, who is ſuppoſed to have been dead, is here an interpolation. I ſee no reaſon for ſuch a ſuppoſition. He might be old and infirm, and conſequently unable to perform himſelf the offices of hoſpitality, which he left to his more able and active ſon. His conſent, however, was here neceſſary; and he is accordingly brought on the ſcene.—For the reſt, it is well known that, in thoſe countries, the brothers were at leaſt as much the guardians of their unmarried ſiſters, as the father. See Michaëlis's *Moſaiſches Recht*, part ii. ſect. 83.

Ver. 55. *A year or ten months.* In the preſent Text, there is only ימים או עשור, *dies aut decem*, which makes no tolerable ſenſe; although our Engliſh tranſlators, by the aid of

* "Les femmes Arabes (ſays La Roque) portent une gaze brodée de ſequins et d'autres pieces de monnoye d'or, "qui pendent autour du front, et de deux cotés des joues." Voyage dans la Paleſtine, p. 219. See alſo p. 225.

† There is no variety of lection in Holmes's MSS. ſave that the Sclavonic of Moſcow is ſuppoſed to have read ευλογησας. Theodoret has σπευσας in a quotation which he makes in his books *on Providence*, vol. iv. p. 608, nov. ed.

‡ The Latin tranſlation in Pol. Complut. is *complacens*; better than the *benedicens* in the London Polyglott.

an Italic eke, and ſtraining the word עשר, have made out the following verſion: "Abide with "us *a few* days, at the leaſt ten." More literally, Coverdale: "Abide at the leaſt ten days," from the Vulgate, *ſaltem decem dies*, and Sep. ἡμερας ὡσει δεκα. But, beſides that או no where elſe ſignifies either *ſaltem* or ὡσει, it is here placed in a ſituation that cannot admit ſuch a rendering.—The Sam. copy has evidently a better reading, ימים או חדש *days*, (i. e. a whole year,) *or a month*. Yet the leap from a *year* to *a month* is ſo great that one is apt to ſuſpect this reading alſo. Houbigant would retain the חדש of Sam. but place it before ימים, *a month of days*, that is, a complete month, as the ſame words are to be taken ch. 29. 14.; and it muſt be allowed that this is a moſt ingenious conjecture*; but as עשור, or עשר, is in all the Hebrew copies, and was read by all the antient tranſlators, ſave Syr. I would rather ſay that the word חדש had been dropped out of the Hebrew Text, than that עשר had been ſoiſted into it. From both Texts, then, we have perhaps the genuine lection, ימים או עשר חדש *a year or ten months*. Onkelos, Jonathan, and both Arabs. muſt have ſo read in their copies†. Both Dathe and Michaëlis have adopted this reading: *Annum, aut decem menſes—Ein iahr, oder zehn monath.*

Ver. 60. *Mayſt thou multiply into many thouſands.* היי לאלפי רבבה. Sis in millia multa. Sep. γινε εις χιλιαδας ‡ μυριαδων. Vulg. *creſcas in mille millia.* And ſo moſt of the other antient verſions, making רבבה ſome definite number. I think it means any very great indeterminate number, and have rendered it accordingly §.

Ver. 62. *Iſaac had come from Beer-elohi-rui.* The preſent Hebr. Text runs thus: ויצחק בא מבוא באר לחי רואי, which in our common verſion is rendered, "And Iſaac came from the way "of the well Lahai-roi."—The phraſe בא מבוא *he had come from coming*, is an uncouth and uncommon expreſſion. It is defended, however, by Aben-Ezra, Le Clerc, and others, who think it ſimilar to the French *il venoit d'arriver.* Houbigant laughs at this explanation, not without ſome appearance of reaſon: yet moſt of the antient interpreters ſeem ſo to have read in their copies. Sep. alone follows the reading of Sam. בא במדבר διεπορευετο || δια της ερημου, *he was walking by*, or *in*, *the deſert*, &c. If מדבר were at all originally in the Text, I would ſay, that the prefix מ had been changed into ב; and that ממדבר is the genuine lection. I am, however, more inclined to adopt Houbigant's correction; namely, that מבוא was originally מעם ¶; or to read, with one of Kennicott's MSS. מבאר without בוא. Iſaac dwelled at Beer-elohi-rui; but went to meet his bride at Hebron, where his father reſided, and where his mother had died.

Ver. 63. *To muſe.* לשיח. Sep. αδολεσχησαι. Vulg. *ad meditandum.* Onk. Tharg. Arab. Perſ. have words that denote *to pray*; and even the Gr. of Venice has ωροσευξασθαι. The Syriac

* And ſeems to have been the reading which the Syr. tranſlator had before him. † Even the Greek of Venice has ἡμεραις και δεκαμηνῳ: which is a proof that the tranſlator either read חדש in his Hebrew copy, or underſtood it. Arab. Erp. who is a very literal tranſlator, muſt have ſo read in his copy, for he has expreſsly סנה או עשרה שהור. ‡ Three MSS. have χιλιας. § Archbiſhop Secker remarks, in his manuſcript notes, that when our tranſlators make רבבה a determinate number, they elſewhere render it 10,000; but here, and Ezek. 16. 7. *a million.*
|| Twenty-five MSS. with Compl. and Alex. have επορευετο. ¶ This conjecture receives ſome authority from a MS. which has מבא עם: for how could the copyiſt have thought of inſerting עם, if it had not been in his exemplar? De Roſſi has no various reading: but his collation is only a partial one; and ſome of his MSS. may poſſibly have ſome variation.

verſion

verſion has למהלכו *to walk:* and this by ſome modern critics is ſuppoſed to be the true meaning of the Hebrew word. I ſee no reaſon to depart from the commonly received opinion. Schultens's derivation to me appears forced and unnatural. But the reader may ſee him on Job 10. 1. and on Prov. 6. 22.

CHAP. XXV.

Ver. 8. *Full of days.* שבע ימים. The word ימים is not in the preſent Hebrew Text: but 5 or 6 MSS. with Sam. and almoſt all the antient verſions, have it, and it evidently is a part of the Text. It is indeed wanting in the Chaldee of Onkelos in the London Polyglott, which has only שבע; but the Complutenſian edition, that of Venice 1590, and ſeveral MSS, have שבע יומין. Arab. Erp. has only שבעאן *, and Gr. Ven. has only κεκορημενος.

Ver. 16. *Caſtles* טירות. Some modern critics imagine that theſe caſtles were moveable cottages, *mapalia.* So Faber, Dathe, Schulze: but Michaëlis *ſchlöſſern.* I ſtill think this is the true meaning: they were faſtneſſes or ſtrong holds for ſelf-defence againſt ſudden attacks: and טיר has never the meaning of *a cottage* either fixt or moveable.

Ver. 21. I have ſaid in my explanatory note, that ſome critics think that the word which I have rendered *for* לנכח, denotes rather the *time* of praying, than either the *cauſe* or *place* of praying. So Houbigant: "Orat Iſaac coram uxore ſua, i. e. cum ea mox congreſſurus." This meaning is ſtrongly ſupported by the Arabic ſignification of נכח, *inire fœminam.* In other places of Hebrew ſcripture it generally ſignifies *over againſt:* and ſo it is here rendered by Onkelos and moſt of the oriental tranſlators; although their verſions have *pro.* But Sep. Syr. Vulg. and Gr. Ven. have reſpectively περι, מטל, *pro,* ὑπερ, which I, with Dathe, have followed in my tranſlation.

Ver. 27. *Who lived at home.* ישב אהלים. Sep. οικων οικιαν †. The word אהל ſignifies not only a *tent,* but any ſort of *houſe* or *home.* Some think that by the words ישב אהלים is meant only that *he led the life of a ſhepherd.* So Dathe, *vitam paſtoritiam præferebat:* and Michaëlis, *erwälte das hirtenleben in gezelten.* I think they mean nothing more than that he lived at home with his parents.

CHAP. XXVI.

Ver. 12. *AN hundred returns.* מאה שערים. The word שער has various meanings; but perhaps all reducible to one root. Here it ſeems to denote a ſpecies of *barley,* of a blackiſh colour, which, as we learn from Niebuhr, is very prolific. Sep. and Theod. κριθην, Syr. סערא. The reſt ſeem to have conſidered שער in its Chaldee meaning, *eſtimation, reckoning.* I have preferred the word *returns:* that is, *an hundred for one;* whether barley, or any other bearded grain: for this is certainly the meaning. Vulg. *centuplum.*

Ver. 33. *The ſwearing well.* שבעה. Sep. ορκος. But Aquila and Symmachus πλησμονη. Vulg. *abundantia:* and this meaning is by ſome moderns preferred to the other. Singular is Gr. Ven. which renders ἑπτα *ſeven:* and, again, calls the city φρεαρ ἑβδομον.

* De Roſſi ſays, the addition is alſo wanting in the Conſtantinopolitan edition of Saadias: which edition I have not the good fortune to poſſeſs. † Two MSS. the Aldine edition and Cyril. Al. have οικων εν οικια.

CHAP.

CHAP. XXVII.

Ver. 38. *PENETRATED with ſorrow.* κατανυχθεντος. I have ſaid in my Note, that it is not probable that the Greek tranſlators * added this of themſelves: I have therefore given it a place in my verſion: but I have, for the ſake of perſpicuity, arranged my Text in a ſomewhat different manner, as the learned reader will readily perceive.

Ver. 39. *Remote,* &c. The Hebrew words are, משמני הארץ יהיה מושבך ומטל השמים מעל, which have been interpreted in two very different manners and oppoſite meanings. All the antient interpreters, and all our Engliſh tranſlators, ſave Purver, render the prefix מ by *of*, or ſome equivalent term: as if Iſaac had promiſed to Eſau a fat fertile ſoil fed by the dews of the heavens. And ſo even Dathe: "Fertilem terram habitabis, e cœlo largè roratam." And Michaëlis: "Fett an boden wird deine wohnung ſeyn, und von oben herab vom himmel beth-"auet." Notwithſtanding all this maſs of authority, I am clearly of opinion, that the verſion of Caſtalio, Le Clerc, Houbigant, &c. is the true one; and that מ here is a privative prepoſition, as it is in ſeveral other places †, and ought to be rendered by *abſque, without.* Indeed without this there would be no contraſt between the benediction of Eſau and that of Jacob. Nor was Idumæa, or Edom, a fat fertile ſoil. On the contrary, Malachi tells us that God had made it a fit reſidence *for the dragons of the deſert* ‡. See the explanatory note.—I will only add, that the Greek verſion itſelf admits this explanation: for απο is often equivalent to *ab*, or even *procul a, remote from:* as απο της πατριδος—απ' ελπιδος, *procul a patria—ſine ſpe.*

Ver. 40. *On thy deſert thou ſhalt live.* על חרבך תחיה. I have, in this inſtance, departed from all the verſions antient and modern. They all render על חרבך *by thy ſword.* Yet I cannot think that חרב here means a ſword. If it did, the conſtruction would have been בחרבך, not על חרבך: at leaſt, I can find no other example of על having that meaning. Iſaac had told him before that he was to inhabit a dry barren ſoil; he now bids him be content with his portion, and live *on the deſert* allotted to him, until the time come when he ſhall be able to throw off the yoke of his brother; that is, of his brother's poſterity.

Ver. 42. *Hath reſolved.* מתנחם. Sep. απειλει. Vulg. *minatur, threatens,* which Dathe follows. I rather think the meaning of the word is a gloomy reſolution of mind, which conſoles itſelf with the hope of vengeance, *manet alta mente repoſtum.* It is well rendered in the Greek of Venice, παραμυθειται.

CHAP. XXVIII.

Ver. 13. *STANDING by him,* נצב עליו, which is generally rendered *ſtanding on it,* i. e. on the ladder. So Sep. επεςηριχτο επ' αυτης. and Vulg. *innixum ſcalæ:* and ſo equivalently almoſt all modern verſions. Yet I am perſuaded that this is not the meaning; and that עליו ſhould here be rendered, not *ſuper eam,* but *juxta eum.* Saadias ſo, certainly, underſtood it ואקפא אמאמה; and ſo, I think, the Syr. Onkelos, and the Thargum of Jonathan §, ought to be rendered. It

* I ſuppoſe they read in their copy ויתעצב, which, in Gen. 34. 7. is rendered by the ſame Greek verb. † See Noldius. ‡ Malach. 1, 3. § This laſt is therefore, in my opinion, rightly tranſlated, in the Polyglott, *juxta eum:* the two former wrong, *ſuper eam.*

is

is not probable that Jacob ſaw the apparition at the ladder's top, which, we are told, reached the heavens; but ſtanding by him עליו at the foot of the ladder. Wherever a word, or phraſe, is ſuſceptible of a double or multuple meaning, that is always to be preferred which is moſt natural and analogous.

Ver. 19. *Ulam-luz.* אולם לוז *. With Sep. †, Capellus, and Houbigant, I take אולם to be a part of the name of the place. Others make it an adverb, and render *utique, certe*; our vulgar verſion *but*. But this laſt word is ſufficiently expreſſed by the præfix ו; and if the word אולם be here conſidered as an adverb, it is viſibly an uſeleſs pleonaſm ‡.

Ver. 21. *And thou be a God to me.* I make this a part of the conditions; not of the conſequent vow: and in this ſenſe it ſeems to have been underſtood by all the antient tranſlators, ſave Syr. Vulg. and Perſ. who took the præfix *vau* in the ſenſe of *tum, then*, and make it a part of Jacob's vow. So our Engliſh tranſlators: "Then ſhall the Lord be my God:" a verſion which Delgado juſtly blames, and well rectifies. Yet Dathe ſo tranſlates *ſemper eum ut Deum meum colam.* Not ſo Michaëlis, nor Schulze, nor Roſenmüller, who all underſtand it as a part of the conditions §. "Ad *protaſin* pertinet; ſequitur *apodoſis.*"

CHAP. XXIX.

Ver. 2. *DROVES.* עדרים. Some modern critics would read רעים *ſhepherds:* and I once thought that a plauſible emendation. But I ſee, now, no neceſſity for rejecting the preſent reading. Delgado's obſervation on the word is apt and judicious.

Ver. 21. *My time is completed.* כי מלאו ימי. Theſe words are ſuppoſed, by ſome moderns, to mean only that Jacob was a full-grown man. "Hæc verba (ſays Roſenmüller) non ad comple-" tum *ſervitutis* tempus, ſed ad maturitatem *ætatis* Jacobi pertinent. Petit ſibi Rahelam, quia jam " ad ætatem plus ſatis juſtam pervenerit." So Michaëlis: "Ich bin ſchon bey vollen Jahren." —I cannot believe that the Hebrew words will bear this meaning; which has been thought of only to reconcile the chronology of the hiſtory of Jacob and his ſons. Dathe follows the common rendering: "Quod tempus conſtitutum eſſet completum."

Ver. 32. *And given me a ſon.* This addition I have inſerted on the ſole authority of Sep. and the old Coptic verſion. It is wanting, however, in Compl. and Alex. and in 8 MSS.

CHAP. XXX.

Ver. 8. *WITH great rivalry,* &c. נפתולי אלהים נפתלתי עם אחתי. This is variouſly rendered by the antient interpreters. Sep. συναντελαβετο || μου ὁ Θεος· και συνανεςραφην τῃ αδελφῃ μου. Vulg.

* The Sam. Text has אולם לוז; but not in one word, as Roſenmüller aſſerts. He was deceived by the Latin verſion in the Polyglott. † Ουλαμλουζ. So Ald. Vat. with Copt.—Nineteen of Holmes's MSS. have Ουλαμμαους and Cod. Alex. with Auſtin, have Ουλαμμαυς· all manifeſt corruptions. ‡ The common meaning of אולם is a *court* or *veſtibule.* Here it ſeems to denote ſome *ſuburb*, or *out-port*, belonging to *Luz* or *Luza.* Perhaps it was ſo underſtood by *Aquila*, whoſe true reading is, with great probability, ſuppoſed by Scharfenberg to have been προθυρον. See his *Animadverſiones*, p. 28. § So before them Houbigant: *et fuerit mihi Dominus in Deum.* || Sixteen MSS. with Compl. and Ald. have συνελαβετο, and two MSS. with Alex. have συνεβαλετο. One MS. has αντελαβετο. Perhaps συναντεβαλετο is the primitive reading.—Aquila, συνανες-ρεψεν με ὁ Θεος, και συνανες-ραφην.

comparavit

comparavit me Deus cum ſorore mea. Both took אלהים for a nominative; but how, out of the preſent words, they could make either of theſe meanings, is to me incomprehenſible. Onkelos likewiſe makes *God* the nominative; but wildly paraphraſes thus: "The Lord hath granted "my requeſt, on my ſupplication: in my prayer I deſired to have a ſon, as well as my ſiſter, "and the boon has been granted me." On the other hand, Jonathan makes *Rahel* the nominative, but paraphraſes ſtill more looſely than Onkelos. The Syr. tranſlator has rendered only the three laſt words, and rightly rendered them: "I have contended with my ſiſter." Saadias: "Commiſeration from God I have obtained," &c. Arab. Erp. רעבא אלה רעבית מן אחתי Gr. Ven. αντιστροφαις Θεου αντεστραμμαι ξυν τη εμη αδελφη. Theſe two laſt have, at leaſt, endeavoured to give a literal verſion of the original; to which let us now return.

The radical meaning of the word פתל is *tortuouſneſs, writhing, wattling*, twiſting*, &c. Hence, in Niphal, it ſignifies *to be writhed*, that is, *to ſtruggle*†; for, in ſtruggling, the body is writhed, and the limbs entwined with thoſe of the antagoniſt. This, then, is the literal meaning of נפתל: but as the ſtrugglings of Rahel were only metaphorical ſtrugglings or emulations, I have preferred the words *rival* and *rivalry*.

Ver. 9. The addition in this verſe is from the Rom. and Alex. editions of the Septuagint. It is wanting in Ald. Compl. and 13 of Holmes's MSS.; but it is found in 15 MSS. and in the Copt. and ſome other verſions made from Sep. I have no doubt of its having been originally in the Text.

Ver. 11. *In luck*, or *luckily*. Whether we read בגד with the printed Hebrew Text and all the Sam. copies, or בא גד with 8 MSS. and the *Keri*, we muſt not give to גד the meaning of our common verſion, *a troop*. It ſignifies both here, and in Iſa. 65. 11. *good fortune*, which was conſidered as a ſpecies of divinity; and from which our term *God* is derived. All the antient verſions concur in rendering גד here by a word equivalent to *good luck*. Sep. εν τυχῃ ‡. Vulg. *feliciter*. Both read בגד with the preſent Text. The others ſeem to have read בא גד; but ſtill גד is rendered *luck*, or ſomething equivalent. Thus Syr. אתא גדי. Onk. אתא גד. Jon. אתא מזלא טבא §. Saad. קדצח אלחבר. Arab. Erp. בא גד. Perſ. ביאמד ניך בחת. The Greek of Venice alone has ηκει χρατευμα. The argument urged in favour of this rendering, from Jacob's alluſion in the benediction of his children, is frivolous. It is well known that the Hebrews played upon the ſame word differently, on different occaſions. Jacob's alluſion to *a troop* would, in the mouth of Lea, have been ridiculous: whereas nothing could be more natural than the expreſſion ſhe uſes; and which ſhe repeats, in other terms, in the very next verſe. Our beſt modern critics have rendered as I have done: Houbigant, *feliciter*. Dathe, *fortunâ favente*. Michaëlis, *zum guten gluck*.

Ver. 20. *With a good endowment hath the Lord endowed me.* זבדי אלהים אתי זבד טוב. The words זבד and זבדי no where elſe occur. Hence they have been variouſly rendered. In Arabic, זבד

* Our words *wattle* and *wattling* are, I doubt not, derived from it. † So the Latin deponent *luctor*; which, by the bye, is conſtrued in the ſame manner as our Hebrew verb *luctor cum*; the root of which, I have no doubt, is the Arabic לוג, to *twiſt*, *writhe*, &c. ‡ So Ald. Vat. and Alex.; but Compl. and 23 MSS. have ευτυχηκα *I am lucky*. If this were the genuine reading of Sep. I ſhould ſuppoſe that they read in their Hebrew copy בגדי, as we ſtill read באשרי in the next verſe: and the Syr. reading גדי ſeems to ſtrengthen this conjecture. § The Jeruſalem copy has גדא טבא, *good luck*.

has,

has, with other ſignifications, that of a *gift*: and in this ſenſe it was underſtood by Sep. Δεδωρηται ὁ Θεος μοι * δωρον καλον. So Vulg. *Dotavit me Deus dote bona.* And ſo equivalently all the antient verſions, even Gr. of Venice, which has κεχορηγηκε—χορηγημα. I ſee no reaſon to ſeek a new meaning. Schultens's tranſlation, *Utrem* (i. e. uterum) *mihi meum optima agitavit Deus agitatione*, a metaphor borrowed from churning butter, is highly ridiculous. See Michaëlis's *Supplementa.*

Ib. *will delight in me.* יזבלני. This word, which with Sep. I render *will delight in me*, is commonly rendered *will dwell with me:* but then it ſhould have been יזבל עמי, for which indeed ſome grammarians pretend it here ſtands. All the antient verſions, however, ſave Sep. and Syr. give the idea of *habitation:* and the word in ſome other places ſeems hardly to admit another meaning. But ſtill that meaning to me appears a forced one here: for did not Jacob *dwell with her* already?—I therefore think the radical meaning is to be ſought in the Chald. and Syr. dialects, the latter of which Lea moſt probably ſpoke. Now in both theſe dialects זבל ſignifies *to dung* a field; and thence, to *cultivate.* I ſee not why this, in a tralatitious ſenſe, may not be the meaning here. "My huſband will now *careſs* me more and more; will con-"ſider me as a fruitful field, and cultivate me with aſſiduity." The alluſion, in our language, is not very delicate: but this is no reaſon why it ſhould be ſo in the Hebrew. To be *kind to a field* is, among farmers, equivalent to *manure it well:* and we have no ſcruple in ſaying, metaphorically, of a prolific wife, that ſhe is a *well-cultivated, fertile ſoil* †.

Ib. *Zebulon.* His name is ſuppoſed, by ſome critics, to allude to both זבל and זבד. I am inclined to think it has no relation to the latter word.

Ver. 32. *Let me paſs.* אעבר. So all the copies and antient verſions, ſave Sep. and Vulg. which have παρελθετω—*gyra* ‡: as if the former had read יעבר, and the latter עבר.

Ib. *Remove.* הסר, or rather הסיר, as Sam. which Pagninus renders *movendo:* but Sep. and Vulg. imperatively διαχωρισον—*ſepara.* And ſo even the Greek of Venice, αφελε. The reſt ſeem to have read אסיר in the firſt perſon; and this appears to be the more natural reading.

Ib. *The grizzled.* חום, commonly rendered *black* §; by our public verſion *brown*; which is more agreeable to the etymon of the Hebrew word. I prefer *grizzled* for two reaſons: Firſt, becauſe I doubt if there be any ſheep of a brown colour. Secondly, becauſe the Syr. tranſlator, who muſt have been well acquainted with ſheep of that country, renders אכם בחורתא *black mixt with white.* This is indeed an uncommon colour; and hence the bargain was the more ſpecious on the part of Jacob: whereas black ſheep are common enough; and perhaps made a very conſiderable part of Laban's flock ||.

* Compl. with 18 MSS. have μοι ὁ Θεος. Note: The Compl. and Rom. editions are here wrongly pointed. The point ſhould be after καλον, as it is in Ald. Alex. and 3 MSS. † The Greeks, in a ſimilar ſenſe, uſed αρουρα: and the Latins *arvum genitale.* ‡ This, however, is not of Jerom, who, in Q. Hebr. thus renders, *Tranſibo*, &c. § So Pagninus, Houbigant, Dathe, Michaëlis, and moſt of our Engliſh verſions; and ſo Onkelos, Arab. Erp. and Gr. Ven. and perhaps the Arab. Pol. חמא ought ſo to be underſtood, although his Latin tranſlator renders it by *verſicolor.* Sep. has φαιον, and Vulg. *furvum.* || In a manuſcript Account of Liſbon I have read the following words: "I ſaw "(in the grounds about the city) on one ſide a flock of ſheep, all white: on the other, at a very ſmall diſtance, an-"other flock, all black: this laſt kind are extremely common here; and I am told it is of their wool that Saragoſſa "cloth is made."

With reſpect to the Text itſelf, there is viſibly much confuſion in it; as Jerom long ago remarked: "Multum apud Septuaginta Interpretes confuſus eſt ſenſus; et, uſque in præſentem "diem, nullum potui invenire noſtrorum, qui, ad liquidum, quid *in hoc loco* diceretur, exponeret." He then gives his own interpretation, which is very juſt, although it is not a literal verſion of the preſent Text. "Wouldſt thou have me ſerve thee, ſays Jacob, ſeven years more? "Grant me this requeſt: Separate all the parti-coloured and variegated both of the ſheep and "goats, and deliver them to thine own ſons to keep apart. Then to me give the keeping of all "the black and white; and let ſuch as ſhall henceforth be variegated among them, be mine. "My requeſt is not a hard one: the nature of flocks is on your ſide: for white commonly pro-"duce white young ones, and black produce black." Q. Hebr.—This, I think, is the genuine meaning! but ſtill the Text is imperfect; and ſhould, in my conception, be thus reſtored: חסיר משם כל שה נקד וטלוא בעזים׳ וכל שה חום בכשבים׳ וטלוא ונקוד בעזים וחום בכשבים ידוה שברי The addition of בעזים after וטלוא is in one of Kennicott's MSS. 173*. The ſecond addition, preceding the concluding comma, is a conjectural emendation, which, in my verſion, I have expreſſed in Italics.—We muſt either admit, I think, this emendation, or with Sep†. throw out the firſt comma altogether, and render thus: "Remove every grizzled beaſt among "the ſheep, and every ſpotted and ſpeckled beaſt among the goats; and let ſuch henceforth "be my hire." There will then be nothing redundant: yet I prefer the other reading, on this general principle, That few interpolations have crept into the Hebrew Text, compared to the many mutilations it has undergone. Beſides, verſe 35. is a guarantee for the order of the preſent Hebrew, and, I preſume, for the alterations which I have made in it.

V. 37. *Plane-tree.* ערמן. Sep. πλατανος. Vulg. *platanus*, whom I have followed. See explanatory note, and correct *platenus* into *platanus*. The other verſions vary: and, indeed, it is very uncertain what peculiar tree is here meant.

Ver. 40. It is hard, if not impoſſible, to make any tolerable meaning out of the Text as it ſtands at preſent, and which is thus literally rendered in our public verſion: "And Jacob did "ſeparate the lambs, and ſet the faces of the flocks toward the ring-ſtreaked, and all the brown "in the flock of Laban." Let him, who can, make any thing of this‡.

The chief difficulty lies in theſe words ויתן פני הצאן אל עקוד. Inſtead of אל עקוד, Sam. has איל עקוד *a variegated ram*; and ſo Sep. κριον διαλευκον. But neither does this reading agree with the context, nor make any good ſenſe. The Latin Vulgate is yet more wild: "*Et poſuit vir-*"*gas in canalibus ante oculos arietum!*" Syr. followed the preſent Hebrew, but gave a different meaning to עקוד. Onkelos, the Thargum of Jonathan, and Saadias, ſeem to have read כל inſtead of אל; which reading is adopted by Houbigant, and gives an excellent meaning; which I have followed in my verſion. Perhaps the preſent reading might be defended, by making אל here the ſign of the objective caſe, as it ſometimes is: but כל or את כל would certainly be more natural, and exclude all ambiguity. With reſpect to פני, it often ſtands for לפני, and may be here rendered *beſide, oppoſite to, apart from*: and was ſo underſtood by the three laſt-men-

* Saadias ſeems alſo to have read it in his copy.

† I mean the common printed editions; for 5 of Holmes's MSS. with Cyr. Alex. have, after προβατον—ποικιλον και περκνον—or περκον; which may be the production of ſome emendator, on comparing his Greek exemplar with the Hebrew.

‡ "Scripturam talem fruſtra interpretari "velis." Houbigant.

tioned

tioned antient tranſlators. I have taken no notice of Dathe's and Michaëlis's verſions *; nor of Delgado's tranſpoſition, becauſe I deem them all ill-founded.

CHAP. XXXI.

Ver. 15. *AS ſtrangers.* כנכריות. So Sam. and the verſions mentioned in explanatory note: to which add Gr. Ven. which has ὡς αλλοτριαι. It is to be obſerved that neither Houbigant nor Kennicott take any notice of this variety of lection in the Sam. copies.

Ver. 18. The parentheſis in this verſe is wanting, as I have remarked in Various Readings, in Syr. Arab. and 4 MSS. but not in either Sep. or Vulg. as De Roſſi too raſhly aſſerts. The former expreſſes it after *Phadan-Aram*, και παντα τα εαυτου: the latter more briefly, by *quidquid*. It is alſo equivalently in Onkelos, although omitted by his Latin tranſlator.

Ver. 20. *Thus Jacob eluded Laban.* ויגנב את לב לבן. Lit. *ſtole Laban's heart*, or rather his *mind*, that is, his *attention*; an Hebraiſm ſomewhat like the κλεπτε νοῳ of Homer.

Ver. 29. *In my power*, &c. יש לאל ידי, which Arias Montanus literally renders *eſt ad fortitudinem manus mea*. Pagninus, *fortitudo in manu mea eſt*. Sep. ισχυει (8 MSS. ισχυσει) η χειρ μου. Vulg. *valet manus mea*. And ſo equivalently all the antient verſions. Michaëlis, however, has ſtruck out a new verſion, which is at leaſt ſpecious. He thinks אל means here *God*: and renders *Eſt pro Deo manus mea*; that is, *Mine own hand is a God ſufficient for me*. So Mezentius in Virgil. Æn. 10. ver. 773.

Dextra, mihi Deus, et telum, quod miſſile libro,
Nunc adſint . . . . . .

But it is not probable that Laban, who everywhere elſe appears very religious, ſhould on this occaſion be ſo outrageouſly blaſphemous. The common verſion, therefore, ſeems far the more preferable †.

Ver. 32. *And take it.* Sep. adds, "but nothing could he detect with him," και ουκ επεγνω μετ' αυτῳ ουθεν. Nobilius miſtakes, when he affirms that theſe words are wanting in Complut. They are there, only with the variation of ουδεν for ουθεν: the former of which is alſo the textual reading of 3, and the marginal reading of 2 MSS.: and ſo read Chryſoſtom.

Ver. 38. *Theſe twenty years*, &c. Dr. Kennicott ‡ fancied that theſe twenty years are different from thoſe mentioned ver. 41. and would render thus, ver. 38. "*During the one twenty years*, &c.: ver. 41. *During the other twenty years*, &c. He ſuppoſes that Jacob was, altogether, 40 years in Phadan-Aram; namely, 14 years as a covenant-ſervant for Rahel and Lea; 20 in Laban's neighbourhood as a friend; and 6 in Laban's houſe, a covenant-ſervant for cattle. By this diſtribution, he thinks, we are delivered from the *diſtreſſes* and *contradictions* that attend the chronology of Jacob.—But whatever become of Chronology, which is extremely uncertain both here and in many other places, certain I am that the Hebrew Text admits not

* The latter took נקד to be an appellative noun, and thus tranſlates: "und ſtellete die weiſſen ſchafe ſo, daſs ſie den "an den füſſen gezeichneten gegen-über ſtunden."

† Yet the Greek tranſlator of Venice appears to have had the ſame idea as Michaëlis: εστι τῳ Θεῳ χειρ ἡ εμη.

‡ *Remarks on Select Paſſages*. p. 26, &c.

of ſuch an interpretation: and that the 20 years in ver. 41. are no other than the 20 years in ver. 38.

Ver. 39. *I was ſcorched*, &c. The preſent Text has ונגבתי; Sam. ונגובת, which Houbigant ſuppoſes to be the true reading; "Superfluit י in fine, ex falſa iteratione litteræ י verbi יום ſubſe-"quentis, et in altero ונגבתי ex falſa imitatione mendi prioris." The Sam. reading ſeems, indeed, to have been that of Sep. *κλεμματα ἡμερας, και κλεμματα νυκτος*. And ſo perhaps Syr. Vulg. and Erp. Arab. although they render in the ſingular. None of them expreſs the affix: which ſeems here awkwardly employed. The Latins ſaid *furari alicui*: but I doubt if the Hebrew language admit of ſuch an idiotiſm. Gr. Ven. clearly thought it could, and muſt have read as the preſent Text: for he renders, not inelegantly, *κλαπεν μοι ἡμερας, κλαπεντε μοι νυκτος*.—I am decidedly of opinion that י made a part of the original word; but that the original word was not ונגבתי but ונגבתי; not a noun, but a verb in the firſt perſ. ſing. Both Onkelos and Saadias, and even the Perſic tranſlator, conſidered it as ſuch; and in truth they could hardly conſider it otherwiſe if they read it with a *jod*. Had the writer meant it as a noun, he would moſt probably have uſed ונגוב, as in ch. 30. 33. Beſides, the ſentence is badly connected as it now ſtands: "What was *torn* I brought not to thee, I was accountable for it; and, *ſtoln* "by day or *ſtoln* by night." Whereas make a verb of the word ונגבתי, changed into ונגבתי *, and join the whole comma to the following verſe; the blemiſh will be turned into a beauty, and the energy of Jacob's words appear in its full force.

Ver. 44. *And let it be for a witneſs.* והיה לְעֵד Michaëlis points לָעַד, and renders *for ever*. But all the verſions are againſt him; and the phraſe is uncouth. If the writer had meant to expreſs the duration of the covenant, he would, I conceive, have uſed לעולם. The emendation is ingenious, but not neceſſary.

Ver. 51. *Which thou haſt erected.* It is clear from ver. 45, that Jacob erected the ſtone. The preſent Text then, which has יריתי, muſt be wrong; and the Sam. reading ירית † right.

V. 53. *The Gods of our fathers.* The preſent Hebrew Text has *the Gods of their father*, which cannot be the genuine reading, if conſidered as a part of Laban's ſpeech; but muſt be looked upon as a mere marginal note, which afterwards crept into the text. A more tolerable reading is that of 10 MSS. and ſome copies of Onk. which have the copulative ו before אלהי; as if Laban had ſaid, *The God* (or *Gods*) *of Abraham, and the God of Nahor, and the Gods of their father, judge*, &c.—Inſtead of אביהם, Sam. and three or four Heb. MSS. with ſome copies of Onk. have אברהם; but this is a ſtill leſs probable reading than the other.—In Sep. the Copt. verſion, and 2 Hebrew MSS. the words are wanting ‡; and Houbigant, Kennicott,

* From נגב, which is not indeed elſewhere found as a verb in Hebrew; but in Chald. Syr. Sam. ſignifies *to parch, to be parched*, &c.; and as a noun, even in Hebrew, it has in ſome ſort that meaning. See Jud. 1. 15. where, what is commonly rendered *a ſouth land*, is by Jerom not ineptly rendered *terram arentem*: and there is little doubt but that נגב, the *ſouth*, imports a *dry* quarter. † The printed Sam. Text יואת; but 2 MSS. have preſerved the right reading ירית, which Onk. and Saadias muſt alſo have found in their copies. In Sep. Ald. Rom. Alex. and in the Copt. verſions, the whole comma is wanting: but it is in Compl. and ſome MSS. which however have *εσησα*. Only *one* MS. (135) has the right reading *εσησας*. It is remarkable that Gr. Ven. has *καλεσαλομεν*; and ſo, it ſeems, the Armen. verſion.
‡ They are, however, in 5 of Holmes's MSS. and in the Armen. verſion.—Some Hebr. MSS. have אביכם *your father*; an evident corruption.

and

and Bp. Law deem them a mere interpolation. They can certainly be eaſily ſpared: but as I am averſe from admitting interpolations without ſtrong motives, I think the true reading אלהי אבותינו has been preſerved by the Syr. tranſlator: and this reading I have followed in my verſion: only rendering אלהי in the plural, as more agreeable to the context. For the ſame reaſon, I prefer the reading of the preſent Heb. ישפטו, which is that of Onk. Tharg. Arab. Erp. Perſ. and Gr. Ven. to the Sam. reading ישפט, followed by Sep. Syr. Vulg. and Arab. Pol.

CHAP. XXXII.

Ver. 1. *Angels of God.* מלאכי אלהים. The word מלאך properly ſignifies a meſſenger; and the angels or meſſengers here mentioned are conſidered by Aberbanel as common travellers, from whom Jacob received the firſt intelligence of the approach of Eſau.—Joſephus calls them *phantoms*, φαντασματα: and, in truth, the whole ſtory has more the air of a viſion, than of a real occurrence. It ſeems to be the counterpart of the viſion mentioned ch. 28. 12. It was not out of the road of nature to *dream* that the ſame God who had, in a *dream* at Bethel, encouraged him to proceed without fear on his journey into Meſopotamia, ſhould on his return to Chanaan appear again to him for a ſimilar purpoſe.—See the next Remark.

Ver. 24, &c. all to ver. 29. ſeems to be a mere viſion or dream. The only objection to this is, that Jacob halted after the viſion was over. To this objection I ſhall oppoſe the anſwer of Roſenmüller, without laying much ſtreſs upon it. "Nec obſtat ſomnio, quod Jacobus mane "claudicaſſet, quum notum ſit, phantaſiæ in dormientibus vim nonnunquam tantam eſſe, ut id "quod in ſomnio læſum videbatur corporis membrum, ex ſomnio expergefactis et vigilantibus "verè doleat."—There is a ſimilar ſtory, in Lycophron, of Jupiter's wreſtling a whole night with Hercules, by whom he was overcome.

Ver. 25. *On the hollow of the thigh.* כף ירך. What part this was has been a ſubject of controverſy among interpreters. It is rendered by Sep. το πλατος του μηρου. Vulg. *nervum fœmoris.* Syr. חרות, rendered in the Polyglott *coxam*, but which ſhould, I think, be rendered *palmam*, as the פתי ירכי of Onkelos is rightly rendered *palmam fœmoris* *.—Saadias has חק †, which is commonly rendered *iſchium* or *acetabulum:* but I queſtion whether it have not here the ſame meaning with the Chaldee פתי. The Perſic has כף, the very Hebrew word, and of the ſame meaning; namely, the interior *palm* of the hand. Gr. Ven. κοτυλη, that is, the *hollow* of the huckle-bone, as it is vulgarly called: but it may deſign any other *hollow*, as well as the other antient verſions.—Moſt modern tranſlators have agreed in rendering the word by *acetabulum*; or ſome ſuch word; that is, the *pan* which receives the *os fœmoris* or *huckle-bone.*—I cannot think that this is the meaning of כף, which denotes a ſmall *curvature* like the interior *palm* of the *hand*, or that of *a ſpoon, ſawcer*, &c. After having conſulted ſeveral anatomiſts on the ſubject, I received from Dr. Baillie of Wind-mill-ſtreet the following very ſatisfactory anſwer: "There is no term of the *hollow of the thigh* uſed among anatomiſts: but Dr. B. thinks that the

* The Thargum of Jonathan has the ſame words, although they are rendered *latitudinem fœmoris.* The Jeruſalem copy retains the Hebrew word כף, which is well rendered *vola.* † Arab. Erp. has חך, if it be not an error of the Preſs.

"paſſage

" paſſage may be explained, with ſome plauſibility at leaſt, in the following manner:—At the " upper part of the thigh, near the buttocks, there is, in the living body, a very conſiderable " hollow between the upper part of the thigh bone and the *glutæi* muſcles which conſtitute the " buttock. This hollowneſs is eſpecially to be ſeen when a perſon ſtands very upright, the " *glutæi* being called into action *. The hollow is ſo very conſiderable, as to be obſervable to " any common obſerver: and a moſt natural expreſſion for it might be the *hollow of the thigh* †. " At this place, any external force may be readily and immediately ſo applied as to throw the " thigh-bone out of its ſituation; producing that ſort of luxation, by which the limb is rendered " longer than that on the other ſide. This explanation appears to Dr. B. to be tolerably clear " and natural: whether it may be perfectly intelligible or ſatisfying to a perſon not converſant " with anatomy, he cannot ſay."—To me, who am no anatomiſt, it is perfectly ſatisfactory: and I think it is the beſt commentary that ever was made on the paſſage.

Ver. 28. *For with God thou haſt contended,* &c. The Text is כי שרית עם אלהים ועם אנשים ותוכל, without any variety of lection either in the Sam. or Heb. copies; and which cannot be rendered any other way than I have rendered. Houbigant, however, and, after Houbigant, Dathe, and Roſenmüller (miſled, I think, by Vulg. and the common edition of Sep.) have given to the paſſage another turn, and, pointing after אלהים, render, or rather paraphraſe, thus: " Quoniam ipſi Deo prævaluiſti, e certamine cum hominibus ſuperior quoque diſcedes." They reject the copulative before ותוכל, and ground the rejection partly on the authority of Sep. and Vulg.; and partly, becauſe, in their apprehenſion, the ſenſe and context require it. Jacob, ſays Dathe, had not yet contended with men: ſo his conteſt with the angel was meant to be a pledge of ſucceſs, if in future he ſhould have to contend with men.—But this is not juſt reaſoning. He had contended with Eſau, and ſupplanted him of his birth-right—he had contended with Laban, and got the better of him—He has now riſen higher in the ſcale, and contended with God—He is therefore to be called ISRAEL, as well as JACOB ‡.—All the antient tranſlators read ותוכל, and underſtood it as I do, except Jerom, who, in his Heb. Q. thus renders: *Quia invaluiſti cum Deo, et cum hominibus valebis.*—The Septuagint verſion has alſo been forced to ſpeak the ſame language: Οτι ενισχυσας μετα Θεου, και μετα ανθρωπων δυνατος εση. So the Roman edition. But Ald. Compl. Alex. and 27 MSS. with Origen, Euſeb. and Cyr. Al. want εση §: and, if this be the true reading, and properly pointed, the Greek will be conform to the Hebrew, and to the other Antient verſions.—The Greek of Venice has very literally rendered the original: ηρξας γαρ συν Θεῳ και συν ανθρωποις, και ισχυσας.—Among moderns, Michaëlis has followed the ſame meaning: Denn du haſt mit Gott und menſchen gekämpfet, und obgeſie- " get."—Not badly Delgado, though uncouthly: " Thou haſt made thyſelf a lord both over

* In the act of wreſtling, I doubt not but this hollow is ſtill more conſpicuous. † If my memory fail me not, this very hollow is, in ſome parts of Scotland, called the *kap*, or *cap*, of the thigh. The ſame word was formerly uſed for a round ſmall diſh, not unlike a ſawcer, for drinking ale and whiſkey. It is indeed the Hebrew word, and of the ſame original import; for, in all probability, the firſt drinking-*kap* was the cavity of the hand. The Swediſh *käpp*, the Dutch and Daniſh *kop*, and our *cup*, come all from the ſame ſource. ‡ This laſt name fitted him with reſpect to his victories over Eſau and Laban; which were obtained by *ſupplantation*, cunning, and diſſimulation: but his prevailing over God was the conſequence of a fair ſtruggle, expreſſed by the name of *Iſrael*. § One MS. has ει: and ſo the old Italic in Auſtin: " Quia valuiſti cum Deo et cum hominibus, potens *es*."

angels

angels and over men, and thou didſt prevail."—This learned and liberal Jew ſeems to adopt the opinion of thoſe expoſitors, who "think there is no reality in this narrative; and that what "Scripture ſaith, That he, Jacob, *roſe up at night*, &c. is the relation of a prophetic viſion to the "end of the chapter."

CHAP. XXXIII.

Ver. 13. *GIVING ſuck.* עלות by our tranſlators rendered *with young*: but as in 1 Sam. 6. 7. 10. "it muſt ſignify cattle which have brought forth; it ſhould here and in Pſ. 78. 71. and "Iſ. 40. 11. in which only places beſides it occurs, ſince it may, it ſhould probably be ſo in-"terpreted." Secker's MS. Notes. So the Ant. verſions, except Sep. Vulg. and Perſ.—Even Gr. Ven. has θηλαξουσιν.

Ver. 18. *Jacob arrived ſafe.* ובא יעקב שלם. Our tranſlators, with Sep. Syr. Vulg. make שלם a proper name, *Salem* or *Shalem*. But this is a miſtake, rectified by Joſephus, Onk. and all the other verſions; even Gr. Ven. which hath rightly σωος. Both Purver and Delgado have here properly corrected the common tranſlation.—It is ſtrange that this correction did not occur to the all-correcting Houbigant.

Ver. 19. *For an hundred keſitas.* I have retained the Hebrew word קשיטה becauſe its preciſe meaning is not known. Moſt interpreters, after Sep. have underſtood it *of lambs*, more particularly *ewe-lambs*. So equivalently all the Ant. verſions.—Some have imagined that it was a piece of money with the figure of a lamb on it: which is highly improbable; as coined money is of a much later date. Others, with Faber, fancy, it might have been a ſilver or gold *vaſe*, or *platter*, which was anciently given in change, in lieu of money. I ſuſpect the word is of Syriac extraction, ſhould be written with a *ſamech* *, and rendered a *belt* or *girdle*. It is well known in what value *belts* were anciently holden. The Greek κεστος and the Latin *ceſtus* are thence probably derived.

CHAP. XXXIV.

Ver. 1. *TO viſit the young women of the land;* probably at ſome general feſtival or aſſembly. She was curious, perhaps too curious, to ſee their cuſtoms, &c.—The ingenious J. M. Lobſtein, from a reading of the Genoveſan copy of the Sam. text, has attempted to ſhew that Dina did not go out of mere curioſity to ſee the Chanaanite women: but to *be ſeen*, and exhibit her own ſuperior charms. "Ut formam, qua ſibi mirificè placebat, terræ incolis conſpiciendam præberet." Admitting this reading (להראות, inſtead of לראות) the words ſhould be rendered *comparere inter filias terræ; to be ſeen among the young women of the land.* But as all the other copies and verſions read as we now do, I ſee no reaſon for throwing upon poor Dina more guilt than ſhe ſeems to have incurred. The objection to the preſent reading, drawn from the ב before בנות is not of much force. Several inſtances occur where it is placed in the ſame ſort of conſtruction. Thus Cantic. 6. 11. לראות באבי הנחל. See alſo 1 Sam. 6. 20. Heb. 1. 5.—Dina then did not

* Even the Maſoretes point the ש as a *ſin*; which is equivalent to *ſamech*.

go

go *to be gazed at* by the young women of the country, but *to gaze at* them. The meaning is well expreſſed by Sep. καταμαθειν; and ſtill better by Jonathan: לימחמי בנימוס *inſpicere conſuetudinem, to obſerve the manners.* Perhaps *to look at* would be the beſt, as well as the moſt litteral Engliſh tranſlation.—Michaëlis: "Bekanntſchaft zu machen"—*to make acquaintance with.*

Ver. 14. The addition from Sep. wrongly marked among Var. Read. as belonging to v. 13. is ſo likely to have ſtood originally in the text, that I had once a great mind to inſert it. It is, partly in all the known copies: and marked with an *obelos* in only two MSS *. The laſt words *and ſons of Lea* are wanting indeed in Compl. Rom. and Alex. but they are in Ald. and more than 30 MSS. as alſo in the Copt. Arab. and Armen. verſions, made from the Greek.

CHAP. XXXV.

Ver. 4. *THE pendants that were in their ears.* הנזמים אשר באזניהם. This is a clear proof that נזם means not preciſely an *ear-ring*, nor a *noſe-ring*; but ſomething applicable to both: I have therefore always rendered it by a more general term, *pendant*. Thoſe pendants ſeem to have been conſidered as ſacred *amulets* or *taliſmans*; and had probably imprinted on them the rude figure of ſome profane divinity. See Le Clerc, and Maimonides.

Ver. 9. Delgado thinks that this and what follows, to the end of ver. 22. muſt be underſtood as if written before ver. 17. of ch. 33. I ſee no neceſſity for this ſuppoſition. The remark of the hiſtorian, that this happened after Jacob had come from Phadan-Aram, was meant only to diſcriminate this appearance of the Deity from that which took place before he went to Phadan-Aram.

Ver. 10. I have remarked in my Explan. Note, that the words *So his name was called Iſrael* are wanting in Syr. and moſt copies of Sep. that is, they are only found in Ald. and Rom. but wanting in Compl. Alex. and 26 MSS. nor were they read by Juſtin Mart. nor by Nicetas:—they are in one MS. with an aſteriſk; and were read by Jerom, Q. Hebr.

Ver. 21. It is clear to me that Sep. has here alone preſerved the due order of the narrative, by placing what is in the preſent text after ver. 20. immediately after ver. 15. Απαρας δε Ιακωβ εκ Βαιθηλ, επεξε την σκηνην αυτου επεκεινα του πυργου Γαδερ. κ.τ.λ. Let the reader tranſfer it to where it now ſtands in the Hebrew, and ſay if it come in there naturally.

Ib. *Beyond Migdol-Eder.* Probably the ſame with that mentioned in Michah 4. 8. Whether this tower were not far from Bethlehem, or near to the Sheep-gate of Jeruſalem, if Moſes had written this, he would not, he could not have expreſſed himſelf in this manner. In deſcribing a journey from Bethel to Bethlehem, he could not with propriety ſay of any intermediate place that Jacob had come *beyond it*, when ſuch or ſuch an event happened: whether he be ſuppoſed to have written his hiſtory in Egypt, or on his way to Chanaan. But, indeed, every thing convinces me, that the Pentateuch, as we now have it, was compoſed at Jeruſalem, or at leaſt in Paleſtine.

* The collator adds Alex. But this and other marks in that edition belong not to the *codex* itſelf; any more than the additions in a ſmaller character. All this is the work of the editor. The MS. is fully expreſſed, either in the text or margin, in one uniform letter of a larger ſize. Thoſe who uſe Dr. Holmes's Collation muſt always keep this in mind.

Ver.

Ver. 16. *But a little way.* עוד כברת *הארץ. It is generally agreed that the word כברת denotes ſome meaſure of length; but what meaſure, it is not ſo eaſy to determine. Some, deriving the word from the verb כבר, make it an indefinite term, ſignifying *a great way*. So Tharg. Bab. and R. J. Menahem. Others derive it from ברה *food* (conſidering the כ as a prefix) and think it means as much ground as one can walk over from morning *to meal-time:* a fanciful and forced explanation. Jarhi is of opinion that it was about a German mile: and this idea has been adopted by Michaëlis, Dathe, Schulze, Roſenmüller &c. They were chiefly induced to this, by the diſtance which Rahel's tomb, according to travellers and geographers, is now from Bethlehem. But who will aſſure us that what is now called Rahel's tomb, is the real place where ſhe was interred? We know that tombs, like catacomb-relics, have been arbitrarily *chriſtened*, if I may here uſe the term: and the authority of a Benjamin Tudelenſis, an Abulfeda, or even of a Jerom or Euſebius, is in ſuch caſes not always to be relied on. All that we know of Rahel's ſepulchre is from 1 Sam. 10. 2. and from Jerem. 31. 15, quoted by Matthew 2. 28. From the former paſſage we learn that the tomb of Rahel was on the way from Rama to Gabatha-Benjamin; by the latter, that it could not be far from Rama; and by Matthew's application of it to Herod's infanticide, that it muſt have been in the vicinity of Bethlehem.—From the Ant. Verſions little light is thrown upon the ſubject. Sep. retain the Hebrew word χαβραθα. In P. P. indeed, ch. 48. 7. they have κατα τον ἱπποδρομον χαβραθα της γης: where I conceive ἱπποδρομον to be their interpretation of χαβραθα; which in pointing ought to be included in a parentheſis: as if in an Engliſh verſion we were to ſay: "And had but a little way (*chibrath*) to arrive at Ephrath."—Syr. פרסחא which, in the Polyglott, is rendered *ſtadium*. But I take it to be the ſame with the Perſic פרסנך or פרסח, which latter is the very reading of the Perſic verſion; and favours the opinion of thoſe who are for a German mile, or *paraſang*. Both Arabs have *a mile* מיל, or 1000 paces; and this may be accounted *a little way* compared with *a paraſang*.—Onkelos has כרוב, indeterminately rendered by his Latin tranſlator *ſpatium*; but which I am perſuaded means *a furlong*, from כרב *to plow:* and this I take to be the moſt probable of all the verſions.—The author of the Latin Vulgate gave another turn to the paſſage, *verno tempore*; which opinion he ſeems to have borrowed from certain Jewiſh interpreters, who, according to Jarhi, imagined that the hiſtorian meant to deſcribe that ſeaſon of the year when the earth was *bored* as it were like a *ſieve*, כברה; namely after the winter froſts, at the commencement of *ſpring*. But Jerom in his Q. Hebr. explains it more fancifully ſtill. After obſerving that Aquila had rendered κατ' ὁδον της γης *in itinere terræ*, he adds: "Sed melius eſt ſi transferatur *in electo*† *terræ tempore*. Porro "*vernum tempus* ſignificat; quum in florem cuncta rumpuntur; et anni tempus *electum* eſt: "vel quum tranſeuntes per viam carpunt et *eligunt* e vicinis agris quidcunque ad manus "venerit." I hardly think that any modern will *pluck* and *chooſe* this interpretation.—Singular is the rendering of Gr. Ven. κατα σημειον της γης. Had he the Arabic ברת in view; which ſignifies *dux* vel *index itineris—a way-poſt* ‡!

* I ſuſpect that the ה in הארץ has been disjoined from the preceding word, and that the true reading is כברתה ארץ, which is ſtill that of one MS. and muſt have been that of Sep. Comp. ch. 48. 7. and 2 K. 5. 19. † From ברה *eligere*. ‡ Which *way-poſt* or *index* might be ſome lofty *pine*, or other *tree*; which ברת in Hebrew ſignifies. See Cant. 1. 7. where our tranſlators have *fir*.

Let us now ſee what help can be had from the other few places in which the word is found. Theſe are only two: Gen. 48. 7. and 2 K. 5. 19. In the former it is only a repetition of the paſſage here. In the latter it denotes the ſpace of ground which Naaman had paſſed when Gehazi went after him to beg a preſent. Now this alone ſeems to afford a proof that the ſpace was ſhort: for it is not credible that Gehazi's avidity would let the Syrian proceed a whole German mile, before he thought of purſuing him. On the whole, then, I think that כברת, or כברתה, denotes a ſhort ſpace of way: and perhaps our firſt Engliſh tranſlators, Coverdale, Matthew, &c. were not far wrong in calling it *a field-breadth*; i. e. *a furlong*: with which, I believe, the ἱπποδρομος of Sep. and the כרוב of Onkelos nearly accord. It is remarkable that in Spaniſh, or rather Moriſh, *buebra* is an *acre* of ground, or *day-work* of land. See Minſhew's Spaniſh Dictionary. Perhaps the Hebrew word might be not ineptly derived from כ and ברית contracted into ברת and rendered a *fragment*, *diviſion*, or *cut* of ground: as we ſtill provincially ſay, "there is a large *cut* of ground between ſuch a place and ſuch another place." Be this as it may, I am fully perſuaded that the word denotes no great ſpace; and have, therefore, with Ainſworth and our Public verſion, rendered *a little way*.

Ver. 22. The addition in this verſe from Sep. is, ſays Roſenmüller, a *frigid* addition. But why? Was it not very natural for Jacob to be diſpleaſed, on hearing that his own ſon had violated his bed? The Maſoretes themſelves were ſenſible, that there was here a chaſm in the text: and ſurely that chaſm cannot be better filled up than by the words in Sep. και πονηρον εφανη εναντιον (or ενωπιον) αυτου. Hebr. וידי בעיניו רע. *Et fuit in oculis ejus malum.*

CHAP. XXXVI.

I HAVE not attempted to reconcile this chapter with ch. 26. with reſpect to the genealogies of Eſau and Seir; becauſe I found it a taſk beyond the compaſs of my abilities; without ſplaſhing the text in almoſt every verſe, and bending it to wild conjecture: which I am never willing to do with the text of any author. Thoſe who wiſh to ſee what efforts have (vainly, I think) been made to ſave the conſiſtency of our hiſtorian may read what has been written by Michaëlis in the 9th tome of his *Oriental Library*, his *Diſſertation on the Troglodytes*, and his German Notes on the Bible for the uſe of the unlearned. They may alſo conſult Delgado's *obſervations* on the place: where they will ſee how far religious prejudice will lead an acute and ſenſible man, in ſupport of the integrity of the Hebrew text.

Ver. 24. *Theſe were the ſons of Zibeon: Ajah, and Anah.* The preſent text has ואיה; hence ſome have imagined, that a name, or more, may have been dropt. But the Sam. text and verſion, with Sep. Syr. Vulg. and 4 MSS, have איה without the copulative; which is alſo wanting, ſays De Roſſi, in the original edition of Saadias printed at Conſtantinople in Hebrew characters: and, what is more ſingular, it is wanting in the very litteral Greek verſion of Venice, which has Οιδι δε υιες Σιβεωνος, Αιας τε και Ανας.

Ib. *It was this Anah who diſcovered the hot-baths* &c. The Hebrew word, which I render *hot-baths* is הימים: but Sam. has האימים: which variety of lection has given riſe to various explanations. Thoſe who follow the Sam. reading render "He found, *i. e.* he met with, *Emims*, "that is *giants*" &c. Onkelos ſeems ſo to have read, as he renders גבירא. This idea was adopted by

by Bochart, and defended by Simon in his Anſwer to Le Clerc: but has been generally abandoned by more modern critics *. The Thargumiſts make הימים *mules*, and think that Anah was the firſt who reared them. The Perſic interpreter was of the ſame opinion. Sep. and the other three Greek tranſlators retained the Hebrew word: but it is hard to ſay whether they followed the Hebr. or Sam. lection. In the copies of Sep. we find it in all the following varieties: αιμιν, αμην, αιαμην, εαμιν, εαμειν, ιαμειν, ιαμιν, ιαμην. One MS. only has ιαμειμ; and ſo read Jerom, *Iamim:* and this I take to be the original reading. This was alſo the reading of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion, according to Montfaucon: but we learn from Jerom, Q. Heb. that the two former read εμιμ. Hence rightly Scharfenberg: "Præferendam eſſe puto "lectionem συν τους Εμμ, quam Aquilæ e codd. MSS. reſtituit Vallarſius; cui et libenter in eo "aſſentior, quod Aquilam et Symmachum (nam et hic ſcripſit Εμμ, non, ut Montef. edidit, Ιαμειμ) "dicit proprio nomine *Emim* intellexiſſe, genus gigantum, quorum origo et ſedes Horræis fini- "timæ Deut. 2. 2. deſcribuntur." But this to me is noway convincing: nor can I think the *giants* have any thing to do here. "He found giants in the deſart" is an uncouth expreſſion: and if the *Emites* were a neighbouring people to the *Horites*, they could not be unknown to them.—I have therefore preferred the Hebrew reading, and rendered it with Vulg. and ſome interpreters mentioned by Jerom, *hot-baths*. "Nonnulli (ſays he) putant *aquas calidas*, juxta "Punicæ linguæ viciniam, quæ Hebrææ contermina eſt, hoc vocabulo ſignari." The Syr. Tranſlator ſeems to have conſidered it in this light; as he renders it מים *waters*: or, as Theodoret ſays, עינא *a fountain*. ἡ γαρ πηγη ΑΪΝΑ καλειται τῃ Συρων φωνῃ. Theodor. vol. i. p. 101. nov. edit.—Both Arabs and Gr. Ven. follow the Thargums; and, with our common verſion, have *mules*.—Dathe: *thermas*.—Michaëlis: *die bäder*.

Ib. *When he was feeding the aſſes*, &c. Aſſes, as well as camels, are ſaid to be very ſagacious in diſcovering water, even under ground; and ſmelling it at a conſiderable diſtance. It might then be the aſſes, which Anah fed, that led him to the diſcovery of ſome copious *ſpring*, or perhaps *lake*† of water; whether *hot* or *cold*, may be queſtioned: but ſtill a copious ſource of water in thoſe arid regions would be accounted a capital diſcovery, and recorded by the hiſtorian as an important event.

Ver. 25. *The ſons of Anah: Diſhon*.... A name may have been loſt after *Diſhon:* but I think the integrity of the Text may be defended. The word ילדי in the maſculine plural here, is not more ungrammatical, than would be in Latin: Nati ſunt ei filius et filia.—The Greek of Venice has therefore properly rendered; Ὁιδι δε υιες Αναου, Δισων και Αωλιβαμα, θυγατηρ Αναου.

Ver. 31. *Theſe are the kings*, &c. This and the 12 following verſes were by Spinoza urged as one clear proof that the Pentateuch could not be written by Moſes: if he had only ſaid that *this part* of the Pentateuch could not be written by Moſes, he would have ſaid no more than

* Except Houbigant: who renders "qui dimicavit in deſerto contra Emæos," &c. but, as our Bate has well obſerved, נגח never ſignifies to *fight with:* but to *meet*, or *come up with*. † A *lake* of water was, in Hebrew, called *a ſea*. The remark of Jerom is here to the purpoſe. "Iiſdem litteris ſcribuntur maria (*aiamim*) quibus et hic nunc ſermo "deſcriptus eſt. Et volunt (quidam) illum [Anam], dum paſcit aſinos patris ſui in deſerto, aquarum congregationes "reperiſſe: quæ, juxta idioma linguæ, Hebraicè *maria* nuncupantur: quod ſcilicet *ſtagnum* repererit, cujus rei inventio "in eremo difficilis eſt." Q. Hebr.

what every diſcerning reader muſt, in my conception, acknowledge. Nothing to me can be more evident than that all this was written after there were kings, or at leaſt a king, in Iſrael.—But no, ſays Roſenmüller and ſome other modern critics: "Evaneſcit hæc difficultas, ſi in "memoriam revocamus, id quod Moſes ipſe paullo ante, c. 35. 11. narrat: Deum ſcilicet Jacobo "promiſiſſe, fore ut ex eo reges orirentur. Vult igitur ille his verbis: *Edomitæ jam octo reges* "*habuerunt*, antequam Deus promiſſum illud Jacobo datum in poſteris ejus impleret."—I confeſs this is an argument I do not comprehend.—Delgado takes another, more ingenious method; and renders his Text thus: "Now theſe are the kings that reigned in the *country* of Edom, "before *the* king that reigned *cotemporary* with the children of Iſrael." But this is as forced, and far-fetched an interpretation as can well be made. The grammatical reaſon is, that, except in this place, מלך is conſtructed with a ב or an על, and never with a ל. But ſurely he is not to learn, that ל holds frequently the place of a על; and muſt, in Engliſh, be rendered *over* *. See Noldius. Not one of the Ant. tranſlators ſo much as dreamed of this refinement: and yet I preſume they underſtood the Hebrew idiom as well as Delgado, or his R. D. Kimhi. As the Greek verſion of Venice excellently renders the paſſage, and is leſs known than the Polyglott verſions, I ſhall here content myſelf with giving it entire: Οιδι θ'οι βασιλεις, οιτερ εβασιλευσαν εν τη γη Εδωμου, πριν βεβασιλευκεναι βασιλεα τοις υιεσιν Ισρκελου.

CHAP. XXXVII.

Ver. 2. *AN evil report.* Some Jewiſh rabbis have imagined that the report which Joſeph brought to his father of his brothers, was their eating raw fleſh torn from live animals.—Others, with Grotius, think it was a crime not to be named. Uſeleſs conjectures! And well ſays Jarhi: "He told his father all the ill he knew of them." There is here an egregious error in the Rom. Aldine and Alex. copies of Sep. κατηνεγκαν δε [κατα] Ιωσηφ ψογον πονηρον. The word κατα, however, is in Ald. only; and this ought to have made the reading κατηνεγκαν be ſuſpected. Complut. has κατηνεγκε; but this has been ſuppoſed to have been inſerted without MS. authority; and to be one of thoſe places which the editors corrected by the Hebr. and Vulg†. Luckily for their honour, I find that ſame reading in ſix of Holmes's MS. and in ſome Arabic verſions made from Sep.—I ſhall, elſewhere, have occaſion to ſhew how much the Complutenſian editors have been injured by latter critics.

Ver. 3. *Becauſe he was the ſon of his old age.* כי בן זקנים הוא לו Sep. ὁτι υἱος γηρως [or γηρους] ην αυτῳ‡. So Vulg. though not ſo litterally: *eo quod in ſenectute genuiſſet eum.* To the ſame purpoſe Syr. both Arabs, and Gr. Ven. But Onkelos, Jonathan, and the Perſic tranſlator underſtood the words בן זקנים to ſignify *a prudent child:* lit. ſays Bp. Law (who ſeems to adopt this interpretation) *the ſon of the elders.* But this is a harſh and unnatural explication: and the other is evidently the meaning.

* Not to mention, that מלך is here in an unuſual conſtruction, both as *noun* and a *verb* together. † Even Scharfenberg leans to this opinion. *Animadverſiones ad Gen.* p. 37. ‡ It is worth remarking that inſtead of *Jacob*, which in the beginning of this verſe is the reading of all the printed editions of Sep. and of the Copt. verſion, three of Holmes's MS, with one or two Arab. and the Armenian verſion, have *Iſrael.* So read Jerom in the old Italic: and ſo all the other Ant. verſions.

Ib.

Ib. *An embroidered coat.* כתנת פסים. By Montanus rendered *tunicam particularum*; *a coat of patches.* And this perhaps may be the literal meaning. Sep. χιτωνα ποικιλον. Vulg. *tunicam polymitam.* Syr. פדיתא, rendered *fimbriatam* in Pol. but which, I think, would be better rendered *verſicolorem.* Onkelos retains the Hebrew term. Jonathan מצויר *embroidered.* Both Arabs דיבאג, rendered *ſericam (ſilken)* in Pol. but which, I am perſuaded, ſignifies the ſame thing. The Chald. מצויר, *figured, embroidered,* &c. Giggæus renders by the Italian word *broccado* (our *brocade)*; and in this ſenſe it was taken by the Perſic tranſlator. The Gr. of Venice keeps cloſe to his Hebrew; and renders περιζολαιον παλαμων, *a coat of hand breadths**; as if every piece of it were no bigger than the palm of the hand.—Whatever were the form or colours of the pieces that compoſed it, it was a coat of diſtinction; and ſuch as was worn by the daughters of kings. See 2 Sam. 13. 18. and the Rem. on that place.

Ver. 4. *And could not ſpeak to him peaceably.* Better, perhaps: *and would not give him the ſalutation of peace,* שלום לך. So Bp. Law in MS. notes.

Ver. 9. *And eleven ſtars.* I have not, with our public verſion, rendered *the eleven ſtars*; becauſe, as Secker well obſerves, it is not known that any cluſter of *eleven* ſtars was diſtinguiſhed from the reſt. They are here made *eleven* to equal the number of Joſeph's brothers.

Ver. 25. I have ſaid in my Explan. Note, that it is difficult to ſay what was the merchandize, which the Midianites were carrying to Egypt. I ſhall here lay their names before my reader, in the original and the antient verſions; which he may examine at his leiſure, and chooſe what he deems the moſt probable.—Hebr. נכאת, צרי, לט.—Sep. θυμιαματων, ῥητινης, στακτης.—Vulg. *aromata, reſinam, ſtacten.*—Syr. רדטנא, צרוא, בטמא.—Onk. שעף, קטף, לטום.—Tharg. שעה, שרף־קטף, לטום.—Saad. הרנובא, תריאקא, שאהבלוט.—Erp. שמעל, טריאקא, שאבלוטא.—Perſ. הרנוב, מום, בלוט.—Gr. Ven. κηρον, βαλσαμον, μαστιχην. Such is the variance among the antient interpreters. Nor are the moderns much more agreed. The curious reader may conſult on the ſubject, Bochart, Celſius, Hillerus; and with reſpect to צרי, *balſam,* a *Diſſertation on the fertility of Paleſtine* by H. E. Warnekros, in Eichhorn's *Biblical Repertory,* tom. xv. p. 227, &c. —In my verſion I have uſed the names which I thought the likelieſt to expreſs the original terms: and have only to obſerve, that the word *laudanum* would be better written *ladanum,* or *ledanum*; not *labdanum,* as ſome moderns ſpell it: for neither Theophraſtus nor Pliny ſo write it. Herodotus has alſo ληδανον "which (ſays he) the Arabs call λαδανον.

CHAP. XXXVIII.

Ver. 1. *AT that time.* בעת ההוא. An indefinite mode of expreſſing any occurrence, or event, unconnected with any particular period: ſomewhat like the τοτε of the Greeks, and the εν τῳ καιρῳ εκεινῳ of the N. T. Hence, in the Roman Miſſal, every Sunday-goſpel begins with *In illo tempore.*

Ver. 14. *At the gate of Enaim.* בפתח עינים. Interpreters differ about the meaning of עינים. Is it a proper name, or an appellative? and if the latter, does it mean *fountains,* or *eyes?* Jerom is

* In Pſ. 72. we find a word from the ſame root פסח, denoting either a *handful,* or a *hand's-breadth:* or at leaſt ſome very ſmall quantity. † Theſe are made two drugs in the Latin, but I am perſuaded they are but one compound.

for

for the latter: "Senſus eſt: ſedit in *bivio*, ſive in *compito*; ubi diligentius debet viator aſpicere, "quod iter gradiendi capiat;" hence Vulg. *in bivio itineris*, &c. The meaning, ſuch as it is, is that it was a place where one muſt *open his eyes* to ſee which way he was to take. Syr. and Arab. ſeem to favour this explanation: and both Onkelos and Jonathan *may* be taken in the ſame ſenſe; although I believe they had *fountains*, not *eyes*, in their view. The Perſic tranſlator is decidedly for *fountains*, חשמהא. The Gr. of Venice has as plainly *eyes*: εν τουλωνι οφθαλμων.—I am inclined to think that *fountains* is the true meaning; but that it denotes the name of a place ſo called; as Sep. properly renders. παρα τας πυλας Ανων*. It was, no doubt, ſo called from the ſprings in its vicinity: as our *Wells* in Somerſetſhire, and elſewhere; *Wellingborough* in Northamptonſhire; *Fontainebleau*, *Sept-fons*, and *Septfontaines*, in France. The Sam. verſion makes it the ſame with כזיב *Chazib* mentioned ver. 5.

Ver. 18. *Thy ſignet, with thy ribband:* that is, the *ſtring* by which the ſignet was ſuſpended. In that manner are ſignets ſtill worne in the Eaſt. See Chardin, Pietro della Valle, and other travellers. We muſt not however imagine that פתיל here ſignifies a *ribband* ſuch as we now uſe; it was only a *twiſted ſtring*. The Ant. interpreters underſtood the word in another ſenſe, and as a ſeparate ornament: Sep. ορμισκον. Vulg. *armillam*. Onk. and Syr. שושיף. Tharg. חוטי, badly rendered *pallium*. Saad שראבת. Erp. מפטול †. Perſ. דשתמאלי. Gr. Ven. καλυπτρα.

Ver. 29. *What breach is this thou haſt made?* מא פרצת עליך פרץ. The midwife was ſurpriſed at this violent and uncommon eruption: and it has been made an objection to the veracity of the fact, as being hardly poſſible. To ſhew the contrary, Michaëlis has given in his German Notes on the Bible two extracts from Profeſſor Wriſberg, and Haller, which I ſubjoin in their own words. The former, who was profeſſor of midwifery in the univerſity of Gœttingen, writes thus: "Bey einer frau auf dem lande, die wegen widernatürlicher lage des kindes bey "einer zwillings-geburt ſchon 48 ſtunden in geburtsſchmerzen zubebracht hatte, und die "herausgefallene hand des einen kindes ganz blau angelaufen war, wurde ich gerufen, nachdem "die hebamme, während ihrer mühſamen und doch überflüſſigen beſchäftigung die hand "wiederum zurück zu bringen, aus verſehen die häute des anderen kindes ſchon zerriſſen "hatte; nach deren zerreiſſung und darauf erfolgtem ausfluſs des waſſers, die in der nähe des "muttermundes liegenden füſſe des anderen kindes beide in die geburt traten. Dieſe wurden "von mir zuerſt ergriffen, und das annoch lebende kind daran herfürgezogen; worauf ich durch "die wendung das erſte kind, welches mit ſeiner hand zuerſt in die geburt getreten war, "und davon die deutlichſten beweiſe durch die blaue farbe der aufgeſchwollenen arme gab, "gleichfalls, wiewohl todt, zur welt brachte."—Haller's Letter to Michaëlis, dated May 2d, 1770, is as follows. "Ob der erſte zwilling ſeine hand zurück ziehen kann?—Ich habe ſchon "geſchrieben, blos die natur könne alles dergleichen bewirkt haben, wenn der kopf des zweiten "kindes zwiſchen den kopf des erſten und die mutter gedruckt wurde. Viel leichter gehet "es an, wenn man annimt, die wehmutter habe die füſſe geſucht, um den erſten zwilling "zu wenden. Iſt aber dieſer handgriff in dieſen erſten zeiten bekannt geweſen? Beym Celſus "ſind ſpuren, bey dem angeblichen Hippokrates keine. Doch die Aegyptier, die erfinder der

* The variety in Holmes's is hardly worth remarking; ſave that Jerom read *Enam*, more agreeable to the Hebrew letters. † This is well rendered, and correſponds exactly with the Hebrew word. See the Root פתל in Caſtell's Lexicon.

"künſte,

" künſte, können handgriffe gewuſt haben, die in Griechenland nicht ſo fort bekannt worden " ſind; und Ariſtoteles ſagt, zwillinge ſeyn in Ægypten ſehr gemein, folglich die nothwen- " digkeit dergleichen geburten zu befördern gröſſer als in kältern ländern."—This remark is very pertinent; and is at leaſt as applicable to the Hebrew women, as to the Egyptian. See the Remark on Exod. 1.—Having conſulted ſome of the firſt practitioners in this metropolis, I am pleaſed to find that they agree in ſentiment with Haller. The following letter was ſent to me by Dr. Combe in 1793. " I think this (caſe) might naturally happen, in either of the two " following poſitions of the children, when the mother has a large well-formed *pelvis*. 1ſt, If, " on the rupture of the membranes, the arm of one child be forced down with the head of the " other, the hand of the firſt child, in a pain or two, will be even with the *os externum*, or a little " lower: at the ſame time the head of the ſecond child, occupying nearly the whole of the " cavity of the pelvis, will prevent the head and body of the firſt child coming down: and, " probably, after ſome ineffectual pains (the children being in this ſituation) the arm of the firſt " child will, in the interval of pain, be a little drawn up; and a ſubſequent pain will force " down the head of the ſecond child; and thus the one who preſented the hand firſt, will be " born laſt.

" 2dly, If, inſtead of the head, the breech of the ſecond child be forced down* with the arm " of the firſt, as before deſcribed, the event will be exactly the ſame."

Dr. Savage is of the ſame opinion; and although in his extenſive practice he has not found a caſe ſimilar to that of Thamar, and that mentioned by Dr. Wriſberg, yet he aſſures me that a German Doctor, who practiſed long in London, and whoſe name was *Cobban*†, had met with a caſe exactly ſimilar.—Mr. Ring, whoſe practice is alſo extenſive, and whoſe obſtetric ſkill is unqueſtionable, coincides in opinion with the fore-mentioned phyſicians. So that, I think, the poſſibility of Thamar's caſe is indubitable.

CHAP. XXXIX.

Ver. 14. *SHE called to her domeſtics.* תקרא לאנשי ביתה—lit. *She called to the men of her houſe*, i. e. the eunuchs who guarded her apartments; according to the eaſtern cuſtom. Lobſtein here again endeavours to juſtify the ſingular reading of the Genoveſan MS. of the Sam. Text, which has לנשי *to the women*, that were about her. His chief reaſon is that if ſhe had addreſſed herſelf to *men*, ſhe would not have ſaid, that the young Hebrew had been brought in " to inſult " *us*" לצחק בנו. But this appears to me a weak objection. She ſpoke as a woman of conſe- quence: and this may be adduced as another example of a plural uſed for a ſingular. See the Rem. on Gen. 1. p. 8. ſecond paragr. Or ſhe might deem the inſult offered to her guardians, as well as to herſelf. I therefore ſee no reaſon for admitting the Genoveſan reading contrary to all the other copies, and all the Ant. verſions.—The reading of this ſame MS. is more probable in

Ver. 20. Where the preſent text has יתנהו אל־בית הסהר, the Genoveſan copy has הסחר both here and in vv. 21. 22. 24. I had long ſuſpected that this latter might have been the original

* Which ſeems to have been the caſe with Dr. Wriſberg's woman.

† Or *Cobburn*: for Dr. S. ſeemed doubtful about the orthography of the name.

reading,

reading, before I knew that Michaëlis had had the ſame idea. I am now almoſt convinced that it is; it being the reading of not only the Genoveſan, but of 10 other Sam. MSS*. It might be imagined, with ſome degree of plauſibility, that Sep. read חסנר, as they render *οχυρωμα*; or that they underſtood חסחר in the ſame ſenſe. This ſenſe is confirmed by the radical meaning of סחר in Chald. Syr. and Sam. dialects; in which it denotes an *incloſed, ſecluded, ſecure* place; *arx, turris, palatium*†: and ſurely no word can better denote a royal priſon or *baſtile*; ſuch as this priſon ſeems to have been. I am not even ſure but that the Hebrew acceptation of the word, applied to *merchandiſe* and *merchandiſing* is to be ſought in the idea of *incloſing* and *ſecuring* goods in warehouſes. See the Rem. on Jerem. 14. 28. and on Pſ. 38. 10. and 91. 4.—I had almoſt omitted to mention the derivation of Aben-Ezrah, Bochart, Jablonſki, &c. who make סחר, or סחר, a compound of two Coptic words, SONH and AREH: of which the former ſignifies *vinctus*, the latter *cuſtodia*. If the word had been found only here, I ſhould not object to this etymon: but in general I am not for ſeeking Hebrew words in a language with which the Hebrew dialect has little or no affinity.

CHAP. XL.

Ver. 4. *SOME days.* ימים, which Bp. Law thought might be *a week*. Others make it a whole year. I have, with all the Ant. verſions, expreſſed it indefinitely.

Ver. 6. *He ſaw that they were troubled.* זעפים. Sep. *τεταραγμενοι*. Aq. *εμβρασσομενους*‡. Our tranſlators followed Sym. and Vulg. *σκυθρωποι, triſtes:* and ſo Houbigant, Dathe, Michaëlis.—It is not however the ſame word with that in the next verſe, רעים; which, with me, they render *ſad*. Sep. *σκυθρωπα*.

Ver. 13. *Will decide thy fate.* Bp. Law "Will call thee to account||—bring thee to trial." which is the very rendering of the Sam. verſion. The other verſions either retain the Hebraiſm, or give it the meaning of *calling to mind*.

Ver. 15. *In a dungeon.* בבור. The common meaning of בור is *a pit, well, ciſtern*; but here it is to be underſtood in a more unlimited ſenſe: for Joſeph ſeems to have then been a priſoner at large, at leaſt within the precincts of the priſon-houſe.

Ver. 16. *Wicker-baſkets.* סלי חורי. The laſt of theſe words is variouſly rendered. Sep. *χονδριτων*. Aq. *γυρεως*. Sym. *βαϊνα*. Vulg. *farinæ*§. Syr. חורתא**. Onk. חירו††. Tharg. נקיא פיתא‡‡. Arab. Pol. חוארי. Arab. Erp. ביץ. Perſic: סוראוֹדאר *foraminous*; which I take to be the true interpretation of the Hebrew word. At any rate the word חורי or חרי can be appli-

* I mention not the ſingle Hebr. MS. which here agrees with thoſe Sam. copies: but which in all the other places reads סחור. † Perhaps of a roundiſh figure; whence Purver ſeems to have taken the fancy of rendering it a *round-houſe*. ‡ So alſo Gr. Ven. *τεθορυβημενων*. The other Ant. verſions will, likewiſe, bear the ſame meaning. || So alſo Delgado in the very ſame words. § So Gr. Ven. *πελανου*. ** Rendered in Pol. *ciborum candidorum*: but which, I apprehend, denotes rather the colour of the baſket itſelf, than of the viands contained in it. Thoſe baſkets were made of *white twigs*, according to the notion of the tranſlator: or perhaps his meaning, as well as that of Onkelos, may be *holey*. †† Abſurdly rendered *plena pane principali*. It ſeems rather to denote that the baſkets were *plena foraminibus*: full of little interſtices, as bread-baſkets commonly are. ‡‡ Jeruſ. רפתא קקבטון.

cable

cable only to the baſkets, and not to their contents; and muſt be rendered either *white*, or *wicker*. Pagninus, Oleaſter, Caſtalio, the Genevans, Le Clerc, &c. are for the former; for the latter, Jarhi, Junius, Houbigant, Dathe, and our firſt Engliſh tranſlators. In the Biſhop's Bible both epithets are joined "white wycker baſkets:" but James's tranſlators retained only the firſt, *white*: which Bate followed. It is rather ſtrange that Michaëlis prefers *paſtry-work*, "*back-*"*werk*."

Ver. 19. *Will decide thy fate.* After theſe words, in the preſent Hebr. and Sam. copies, we find the following word מעליך; *from off thee.* Which in my Explan. Note, I have repreſented as an interpolation, ariſing from its proximity to the מעליך at the end of the verſe. It is wanting in *one* of Kennicott's MSS. and was wanting at firſt in 2 of De Roſſi's. But, on the other hand it is in all the Ant. ver. ſave Vulg. and I am not ſure but it is there included in the word *auferet*. If it be genuine, we muſt here give a new meaning to the words ישא את־ראשך, a meaning which I think they can hardly bear; and render "Pharaoh will take off thy head." But I believe, a ſingle other inſtance cannot be produced, where נשאת את־ראש ſignifies *to take off a head.* I am therefore ſtill inclined to think that the firſt מעליך in this verſe is a very old interpolation; borrowed from the ſecond מעליך.

CHAP. XLI.

Ver. 2. *ON a meadow.* באחו. Sep. *εν τῳ αχει**. Vulg. *in locis campeſtribus.* Onk. באחוא retaining the Hebrew word. Syr. במרגא *in viridario.* Tharg. בגו גומיא *in medio pratorum*†. Saad. פי אלקרט ‡ rendered *in gramine:* but the word is by ſome ſuppoſed to mean that particular graſs called *ſainfoin, onobrychis.* Ar. Erp. פי אלמרג *in prato.* Perſ. در علفزار *in gramineto.* Gr. Ven. *εν τῳ λειμωνι.* Thus all concur in making it either *a meadow*; or graſs growing on a meadow: but ſome of the terms are ſuppoſed to denote a particular graſs. We learn from Jerom that the word *αχει* was in his time conſidered as an Egyptian word, which ſignified *omne quod in palude virens naſcitur.* The Coptic tranſlator having retained the word *ahi*, with the Copt. art. *pi*; makes this more probable. It is worth remarking that in the Celtic dialect formerly ſpoken in Scotland *ach* was the name for a *meadow* or *field:* and makes a part of many compound proper names in that country. The Scottiſh *hauch* ‖, and the Engliſh *haugh* §, are of the ſame origin.

Ver. 16. *Without God*, &c. The Text has בלעדי׳ אלהים יענה, literally rendered by Pagninus, *Præter me, Deus*, &c. So the Latin Vulgate, *Abſque me*, &c. and ſo equivalently Onk. both Arabs, Perſ. and Gr. Ven**. But the Sam. lection בלעדי אלהים׳ לא יענה, which was

* So Vat. and Alex. But Compl. 1 MS. and Copt. have *αχι*; and Ald. and 2 MSS. have *οχθη*. Philo too has *οχθας*. Jerom (Comment. in Iſ.) read *αχει*, and I have little doubt but that the original reading of the Text was אחי. See the Remark on Ecclus. 40. 16. † So the Latin tranſlator of Tharg. Bab. but the tranſlation of Tharg. Jeruſ. is *in medio careſtorum*; although it is the ſame word in the Chaldee. ‡ From which, I believe, comes the Latin *pratum*; *k* in *p* mutato: and not from the ridiculous etymon of Vulpian.

‖ Dipple, Dundurcas, Donnaleith, and Devay
Are the three fineſt *hauchs* (meadows) along the Spey.

§ As in *Wooler-haugh-head.* ** *χωρις εμου.*

followed by Sep. * and Syr. † appears to be by far the better reading; which I have accordingly followed in my version. Point, then, בלעדי with a *tserê:* for there is no necessity of reading with Houbigant בל בלעדי.—Michaëlis paraphrases thus: "This is above my power: God "alone can give to the king a lucky and desirable answer."—Dathe: "Josephus vero negavit, "sibi hanc inesse facultatem; interim sese vehementer optare, ut Deus ei salutaria indicet." Can this be called a *translation?*—Better Rosenmüller: "Nihil ad me: Deus respondebit pacem "Pharaoni, &c." They all followed the present Masoretic reading.—But best of all, in my opinion, Houbigant: "Nemo, inquit, Pharaoni prospera nuntiare, sine Deo potest."

Ver. 34. *Take up a fifth part of* the produce of *the land.* חמש את ארץ lit. *fifth the land*; as Secker renders; in the same manner as we say to *tithe.*

Ver. 38. *With a god-like mind.* אשר רוח אלהים בו. *In whom is the spirit of a god.* A pure Hebraism, denoting a superior degree of penetration and wisdom: as is well explained in the next verse.

Ver. 40. *At thy word shall all my people move.* על פיך ישק כל עמי. Pagninus, deriving ישק from נשק, renders it *osculabitur:* and our Chandler was of the same opinion. But Secker justly observes that "על פי ישק cannot signify to kiss the mouth; but must be rendered *juxta man-* "*datum:* but *osculari juxta mandatum* is no sense." Others, from the same root, would render it *armed*; as if Pharaoh had said: "all my people shall be *armed* at your command." The Thargums ‡, and the Greek of Venice § favour this interpretation. I derive the word from שוק, and take it in the meaning of *discurs itare*, to be ready to run one's errand at his desire: *to move* at his pleasure: like the Centurion's servants in Matthew 8. 9. who *went*, when he said: *go!* and *came*, when he said: *come!*—Perhaps another meaning, equally probable, might be drawn from the same root שוק, in the sense which we give to תשוקת Gen. 3. 16. And so I think must Sep. be understood επι τῳ στοματι σου ὑπακουσεται πας ὁ λαος μου. And Vulg. *obediet.*—Rosenmüller prefers a meaning suggested by Lentz, who derives ישק from the Arabic נשק to which they give the signification of *pangere, compingere*; and then apply it metaphorically to the strict attention which the Egptians were, by their King's order, to pay to Joseph's commands. "Per metaphoram aliquis *super os* vel *ori alterius appactus* dicitur, qui "ejus jussis perfectum obsequium præstare debet, ita ut ab ejus ore recedere seque avellere non "possit. Simili quadam phrasi dicitur, *ab ore alicujus pendere.*" This is quite in the manner of Schultens: that is, in my opinion, an unnecessary refinement. Were I to call in the Arabic here to aid, I would rather say, that the meaning is *ordinari*; to be always *ready* to receive orders: which would nearly fall in with our common version "be ruled."

Ver. 42. *Muslin.* שש. Forster has so ably proved this to be *cotton (gossypium arboreum)* that it now passes for unquestionable, among Biblical critics. See his work *On the Byssus of the Antients*, sect. 10. p. 46.—See also Pliny, l. 19. c. 1. and Pollux's *Onomasticon*, l. 7. c. 17.

Ver 43. *Abrech.* אברך. That this proclamation was made in the Egyptian tongue, we cannot entertain a doubt: but we are not quite so certain, that the Hebrew historian might not have given the Egyptian word a Hebrew turn; as, in my opinion, he has done with respect to

* Λνευ τ'ȣ Θεου, ουκ αποκριθησεται το σωτηριον Φαραω. † סבר אנת' רבלעד אלהא' נענה שלמא לפרעה׃

‡ יתוינן. § ὁπλιειται.

the

the name of *Moſes*.—Yet, every thing conſidered, it appears more probable, that here, at leaſt, he retained the original term; and, therefore, we are naturally led to ſeek its etymology and meaning in the Egyptian language. Two learned authors, Jablonſki and Forſter, have accordingly given their explanations of *Abrech*, from the Coptic dialect. The former makes it a compound of OUBE *contra*, and REK *inclinare*, *bow towards*. The latter compoſes it of HA-PRE-CHEK; which he renders *a-rege-cinctus*: as if the royal proclamation had been to this purpoſe: "Behold the man whom the king hath clothed:" ſimilar to that in Eſther: "Thus ſhall it be "done to the man, whom the king delighteth to honour."—This is ingenious; but I doubt much of the juſtneſs of the etymon; although my knowledge of the Coptic is *yet* too inſignificant to qualify me a competent judge. The other derivation pleaſes me much better; the more eſpecially as we learn from Origen (in Catenis) that the word in queſtion implies *genuflection*, γονατιζειν; which was moſt probably the very word uſed by Aquila, and not προγω, as in Montfaucon. See Bahrdt's edition of the Hexapla, t. 1. p. 252.—To the ſame purport the Latin Vulg. "ut omnes coram eo *genuflecterent*." In a ſimilar ſenſe it was taken by Arab. Erp. ארעוא; and by Gr. Ven. γονυπετειν.—But what ſhall we ſay of the verſion of the Septuagint? which is as follows: και εκηρυξεν (or εκηρυσσεν) εμπροσθεν αυτου κηρυξ: *an herald proclaimed before him*. It is plain they either took אברך for a nominative agreeing with יקרא (for ſo they muſt have read in the ſing. with Sam. and 3 MSS.) and conſidered it as equivalent to κηρυξ; or omitted to tranſlate it at all, which is hardly credible. It was their general cuſtom, when they could not readily find a Greek equivalent, to retain the original word, as above in אחי, and below in צפנת־פענח: they would, then, have given us αβρεχ, or ſome ſuch word: if they had not looked upon אברך as an appellative Egyptian noun of the ſame meaning with κηρυξ in Greek. I anxiouſly looked for ſome various reading in Holmes; but found not even the trace of one. Thoſe tranſlators, living at Alexandria, had it in their power to conſult the Copts concerning the meaning of the word: and if they had not been convinced that it meant κηρυξ, it is not at all probable that they would have uſed that term. In turning to the Coptic verſion, made from theirs, I find κηρυξ rendered ΑΠΙΚΥΡΙΞ: did the tranſlator borrow this from the Greek; or is it a real Coptic term? I have in vain looked for it in La Croze: but if it were a genuine Coptic word, perhaps, in the hands of a thorough Coptic ſcholar, it might be reſolvable into our אברך. —Be this as it may, my great regard for the Septuagint makes me ever loth to abandon them, where their verſion has not been vitiated by careleſs copyiſts, or daring correctors.—With reſpect to the other antient tranſlators, except the four already mentioned, they appear to have conſidered אברך not as an Egyptian, but an Hebrew compound of אב and רך: and they are generally agreed about the meaning of אב, but differ about the meaning of רך. The Syr. tranſlator ſeems to have underſtood all that follows in the verſe, as a part of the proclamation. אבא ושליטא על כלה ארעא דמצרין. But how he could draw this out of the preſent Hebrew Text, is to me inconceivable. For in the firſt place he muſt have conſidered the ſyllable רך as an uſeleſs adjunct, and either not found or ſuppreſſed, in his text, the word אתו. Then, indeed, the Hebrew might be thus literally rendered: *Pater, et datus* (i. e. *conſtitutus*) *ſuper omnem terram Ægypti*—On the other hand, according to ſome commentators, רך denotes *a king*; and conſequently אברך ſignifies *the king's father*; as if Joſeph had, by this proclamation, been declared to be the *father* or *guide* of Pharaoh.—So it was underſtood by Onkelos: דין אבא למלכא *This is a father to the*

king: and from Jarhi we learn that רך in Syriac is *a king*. But it is not clear that either in Syr. or Chald. it had that meaning before Syria and Paleſtine were Roman provinces. The Thalmudiſts ſeem to have borrowed their רך or רכא from the Latin *rege*, the ablative of *rex*; or from *rex* itſelf, by the apocopé of *s*, of which and *k* the *x* is compoſed. This to me appears the more credible, as I find them elſewhere making the ſame apocopé in words derived from the Greek and Latin: thus אונך for *ονυξ*, קליב *chalybs*, ידקי *Judex*.—Jonathan underſtood רך in its common acceptation, *tener*, *tenellus*; *tender*, *delicate*; and this interpretation pleaſed a Rab. Judah (apud Jarhi*); and was adopted by Jerom, in his Q. Hebr. where he thus writes: "Mihi videtur non tam *præco*, ſive *adgeniculatio*, quæ in ſalutando vel adorando Joſeph accipi "poteſt, intelligenda: quam illud quod Hebræi tradunt, dicentes *patrem tenerum* et hoc ſer-"mone transferri: AB quippe dicitur *pater*; RECH *delicatus*, ſive *tenerrimus*; ſignificante "Scripturâ, quod juxta *prudentiam* quidem *pater* omnium fuerit; ſed juxta ætatem *tenerrimus* "*adoleſcens* et *puer*." This is preciſely the language of the Thargums רב בחכמתא׳ ורכיך בשניא: "In wiſdom great, although a child in years." But this ſhews that the good Jerom was ſometimes led into *childiſh* explanations by his Rabbinical tutors, againſt his own more critical judgment. On the whole, then, we muſt hold to the Coptic derivation of אברך, or ſay that it is here a Chaldaiſm for הברך, in which caſe it will ſignify *Bend the knee*. Or, perhaps, even in its preſent form, it might be plauſibly explained *I bend the knee*, metaphorically *I bleſs*, or *ſalute*: as in French or Italian *Je vous baiſe la main*; *Vi baccio la mano*; *I kiſs your hand*; by way of mere ſalutation.

Ver. 45. *And Pharaoh called Joſeph's name Zaphnath-Paaneah.* That Joſeph's new name would be Egyptian, there can be no doubt; but it may here again be queſtioned, whether the Hebrew hiſtorian might not accommodate that name to his own language. The Hebrew terms are צפנת־פענח in the preſent Jewiſh copies †; and צפינתי־פענה in the Samaritan copies ‡.—Are theſe Hebrew or Egyptian words? The Jewiſh writers, in general, conſidered them as Hebrew; and render them by terms that mean *the diſcoverer of ſecrets*. Thus Onkelos גבריא דטמירן גלין ליה *the man to whom ſecrets are revealed*. To the ſame purport Jonathan and both Arabs; and Joſephus in his interpretation of the name ||.—Syr. Perſ. and Gr. Ven. retain the original word; which in the laſt is thus written Σαφναας Παανεχαν; and in Syr. explained to be *one to whom ſecrets are diſcovered*.—The Latin Vulg. only, has *ſalvatorem mundi* (the ſaviour of the world) which Jerom in Q. Hebr. thus defends: "Licet Hebraicè hoc nomen abſconditorum reper-"torem ſonet; tamen, quia ab Ægyptio ponitur, ipſius linguæ debet habere rationem: inter-"pretatur ergo, ſermone Ægyptio, *ſalvator mundi*; eo quod orbem terræ ab imminente famis "excidio liberârit." This interpretation was adopted by the generality of Rom. Catholic commentators; but as generally rejected by thoſe of the Proteſtant communions. It has, however, lately been brought into credit again; as we ſhall ſee in the ſequel.—But let us firſt

* For which, however, he was laughed at, by another Jew of Damaſcus. "Dixit ei filius Durmaſkith: Quouſque "tu nobis detorques ſcripturas? non notat אברך niſi ברכים *genua*; quoniam omnes ingrediebantur ſub illius (Joſephi) "poteſtate." † There is ſome ſmall variety in the MSS. One has מחנח for מענח, one has מע נח in two words: one has מחוע מענח; and one has מנעם—all probably erroneous. ‡ Three MSS. have עמנתי without a *jod* after מ; and this I conſider as the better reading. || σημαινει γαρ το ονομα ΚΡΥΠΤΩΝ ΕΥΡΕΤΗΝ. Antiq. l. 2. c. 6. So Theodoret: απορρητων ερμενευτην; and Chryſoſt. των κρυπτων γνωστης.

notice

notice the ſingular reading of the Septuagint, Ψονθομφανηχ *. It is remarkable, that, in this name only they have changed into *pſi* the Hebrew *tſadé*; which every where elſe they expreſs by *ſigma*. This inclines me to believe, that they had in view the Egyptian or Coptic term: which, reſiding at Alexandria, they might readily learn: if, indeed, the Coptic were not their ordinary language.

This being premiſed, let us now ſee what can be ſaid in favour of, or againſt, each of the above opinions.—There are two ſtrong arguments, in my apprehenſion, againſt the opinion of thoſe who deem the words pure Hebrew, and render them *the revealer of hidden things*. For in the firſt place פענח is not Hebrew; at leaſt it occurs no where elſe in the whole Hebrew Scripture; nor is it found in any other ſiſter dialect. 2dly, Were it ſuppoſed to be an Hebrew word, and to ſignify *a revealer*; and that the preceding word צפנת meant *ſecret* or *hidden things*; which may readily be granted: yet ſtill the conſtruction would not be Hebrew; and in order to make of it a genuine Hebraiſm, the words muſt be tranſpoſed, and written thus פענח צפנות, or פענח מצפני: as Gen. 37. 19. בעל החלמות *a maſter of dreams*; not *a dream-monger*, as we ſay in Engliſh: and Pſ. 7. 10. בחן לבות *ſearcher of hearts*, not *heart-ſearcher*.—In like manner, not to go out of the Pentateuch, בניתן Gen. 35. 18. גלעד Gen. 31. 47. אהליבמה Gen. 36. 4. יתמר Exod. 6. 23. אהלאב Exod. 31. 6. בלעם Num. 22. 5.—Some compound proper names beginning with אבי, אחי, מלכי and אדוני are not to be accounted exceptions, as they are formed after a different manner, and are in reality reducible to the general rule.—Could I at all believe the name given to Joſeph to be Hebrew, or rather by the Jewiſh hiſtorian converted into Hebrew; I would give the preference to the Sam. reading צפנתי פענה, and render it with the Sam. tranſlator טמירתי גלא *what was hidden from me he hath revealed*, i. e. "interpreted my prophetic dreams!"—Here the conſtruction would be regular, as well as the mode of nomination: and פענה might be a quadrilitteral, like מהמה, from the Arabic פען, *aperuit, pandit*.

But ſtill I am much more inclined to believe the word, or words, pure Egyptian or Coptic; and that in Coptic the meaning is to be ſought.—Forſter, in the Work already quoted, makes it a compound of SACH-PNOUTI-PA-ENEH-ICH; which he renders *The divine ſcribe of the eternal Spirit*: as fanciful and far-fetched an etymology, in my idea, as ever was imagined.—Bernard, in his very learned note on Joſephus †, thinks that the original Coptic name was PSOTHOMOUPONEI: which he explains: *Arcanum ille mihi recluſit*; which exactly coincides with the Sam. reading, as I have above underſtood and rendered it: and this coincidence is the more remarkable, as Bernard ſeems not to have known that reading, or not to have attended to it.—Jablonſki, in his Letter to Michaëlis ‡, writes the name thus: PSOTEMPHENEH ‖; and renders it *Salvator mundi*; the ſame meaning that Jerom had long before learned from the Egyptians themſelves.—This is, undoubtedly, the moſt ſpecious and moſt probable interpretation, that has yet been given; and I ſee no great cauſe for fiſhing in Coptic gloſſaries for another ſignification: although I have ſtill ſome doubt, whether this even be the true reſolution of the Hebrew word:

* There are 8 or 9 various readings in Holmes; but of very little importance: except that in 1 MS. as in Copt. the word terminates with κ inſtead of χ; and that one MS. (75) has an additional interpretation ſimilar to that of Vulg. ὁ εστιν σωτηρ κοσμου. † Antiq. l. 2. c. 6. ‡ In the 9th tome of *Oriental Library*, p. 202. ‖ Compounded of P the article, SOT, a ſaviour; and EMPHENEH, the genitive of ENH αιων, *age, world*.

and

and perhaps ſome one, more deeply verſed in Coptic litterature than I, may yet find a more ſuitable etymon. I have ſometimes thought it might be compounded of SBÔ, *prudence*, and PHEN PÔU, *abundare, abundans*, an epithet perfectly ſuitable to Joſeph; but I fear it is not according to the rules of Coptic compoſition, and lay no ſtreſs upon it.—I had almoſt forgotten to obſerve, that Scholtz * writes the Coptic name of Joſeph thus: *Thophentepheneb*; or *Jophentepheneb*; but gives neither tranſlation, nor reſolution of its component parts.—The reader who is curious to ſee more on this ſubject may conſult the above quoted writers, Montfaucon's note in his Hexapla, Roſenmüller's *Scholia* in Geneſ. and the 16th ch. of J. Gregorie's Obſervations.

Ib. *Potipharaoh.* פוטי־פרע. Sep. Πετεφρη: but 8 MS. have Πεντεφρη or Πεντεφρι; and this I take to be the genuine reading: for PHONT in Coptic, ſignifies *the prieſt*, and PHOURO *the king*. He was the *king* or *chief* of the Egyptian prieſts. It was common with the Hebrew writers to drop a *nun* out of words which they Hebraized; and even out of their own words, for the ſake of abbreviation.

Ib. After *the prieſt of On*, there is, in the preſent Heb. and Sam. Text ויצא יוסף על־ארץ מצרים *And Joſeph went out over the land of Egypt* †; and this addition, with ſome ſmall variety, is in all the antient verſions, ſave Sep.‡ Yet I cannot think that it ſtood here originally: ſo ſingularly awkward is its poſition: for it connects not with what precedes, nor with what follows. I have therefore rejected it among the Various Readings; as a probable interpolation.

Ver. 56. The clauſe which I have marked as wanting in Sep. is in 5 of Holmes's MSS.

CHAP. XLII.

Ver. 1. *WHY gaze ye at one another?* למה תתראו. I prefer this to the Sam. תתיראו (the *jod* is wanting in 1 MS) which, however, was the reading of Syr. Jonathan, and the Perſic tranſlator. The other antient interpreters read as we do; although they ſeem, at firſt ſight, to convey another meaning. Sep. ἱνατι ραθυμειτε. Onk. תתחזין. Saad. תתואנוא. Vulg. *Quare negligitis. Why this delay? why look ye idly at one another?* "Solent enim (ſays rightly Roſenmüller) ſe invicem aſpicere, qui in aliqua re moras nectunt." Gr. Ven. του χαριν ὁραθησεσθε. Arab. Erp. איש תתראון.

Ver. 10. The words *to him*, ſaid in my Var. R. to be wanting in Sep. are found in only one of Holmes's MSS.

Ver. 30. *And took us for ſpies*, &c. ויתן אתנו כמרגלים lit. *et dedit nos ut exploratores.* The Septuagint either read or underſtood the word במשמר *in cuſtodia*, after אתנו; as they render και εθετο ἡμας εν φυλακῃ (3 MSS. εις φυλακην): and, indeed this reading has much more of the Hebrew idiom than the preſent: whatever pains Glaſſius and others have taken to defend it. I am, even now, convinced that it was the original reading: and am ſorry that I neglected

* In his Coptic Grammar, p. 3. publiſhed by Woide in 1778. † Some MSS. בכל ארץ; and Syr. Arab. and ſome copies of Onk. read either בכל or על כל: but De Roſſi miſtakes when he claſſes Sep. with them. ‡ It is found in 3 of Holmes's MSS. but theſe, I ſuſpect, have been retouched on the Hebrew. They are numbered 15. 82. 135.

it

it when I made my Tranſlation, which I wiſh to be thus rectified: "*and put us* †*in priſon*|, *as* "*ſpies.*"

Ver. 11. *True men.* Sep. and Vulg. *pacific.* Better Aquila ορθοι, *upright, fair-dealing, honeſt.* Sym. αἰπλοι.

Ver. 15. *By the life of Pharaoh.* חי פרעה This oath in Egypt was nearly as tremendous and as common, as חי יהוה among the Iſraelites. Joſeph would not here ſwear by the latter; as that might have betrayed him.

Ver. 32. I preferred the reading of Vulg. *one father*, partly on account of the parallel place, ver. 13. and partly becauſe *our father* ſounds oddly in Engliſh. I would not, however, affirm that אבינו is not the genuine reading; or that even the author of the Vulg. read otherwiſe in his copy; as his *uno patre geniti* may be only a paraphraſe. Thus Houbigant, Dathe, and Michaëlis, render as the Vulg. although they read אבינו in their copies.—The former uſes the very words of Vulg. Dathe: *fratres unius patris.* Michaëlis: "brüder, die einen vater hatten."—In Holmes's Var. Read. I find that the Slavonic Oſtrog. verſion has alſo *patris unius.*

Ver. 37. *Both my ſons.* את שני בני. In ch. 46. 9. we read that Reuben had four ſons, and theſe are ſaid to have come with Jacob into Egypt. They muſt then have been born in the interval between this colloquy and Jacob's migration: or we muſt underſtand the words "went "down with Jacob," in ch. 46. 9. 26. to be ſpoken proleptically: and this is the more probable, as the ſons of Benjamin, to the number of *ten*, are likewiſe reckoned among the progeny of Jacob, who went with him into Egypt.

CHAP. XLIII.

Ver. 11. *PALM-HONEY.* So in my verſion I have rendered the Hebrew word דבש; after Bochart and Celſius. I am now convinced, that it is the *inſpiſſated juice of the grape:* ſtill called at Aleppo by the ſame name *dibs*, דבס. "It has much the appearance of coarſe honey, "but is of a finer conſiſtence.—It is much uſed by the inhabitants of *Aleppo*; is brought to "town in great goat-ſkins, and retailed in ſmall quantities in the bazars." Ruſſel's Aleppo, vol. i. p. 82.—See other authorities in Roſenmüller. In truth, neither common honey nor palm-honey could have been conſidered as a rare gift to a governor of Egypt, where palms and bees were ſo abundant: whereas raiſin-honey, or a ſyrup made out of the grapes, which grew not in Egypt, might be deemed even a royal preſent.

Ver. 14. *But if I be bereaved*, &c. So Sophocles, Œd. Tyr. 1471. Αλλ' ἡ μεν κ.τ.λ.

Ver. 27. Although, in my verſion, I have rendered this verſe agreeably to the reading of the preſent Hebrew; I am now fully convinced, that the Sam. reading עודנו without the interrogative ה is the genuine lection: and that the verſion ſhould be: "Is your father, the old man "whom you mentioned as being ſtill alive, well?" This reading muſt have been that of the Septuagint. For although the editors of the London Polyglott and of the Alexandrian MS. and Bos in his edition of the Vat. copy, have pointed thus the words: πρεσβυτης, ὁν ειπατε; ετι ζη; and although Dr. Holmes has followed this vitious punctuation in his new edition of the Septuagint: it is certain that the Roman edition of Sixtus Quintus reads and points thus: και ειπεν αυτοις. ει ὑγιαινε,

ὑγιαινει ὁ πατηρ ὑμων ὁ πρεσβυτης, ὃν ειπατε, ετι ζῃ. On what authority, or for what reaſon, the London editors and Bos changed this punctuation, I know not; unleſs it were to force the Septuagint reading to ſpeak the Hebrew reading; which after all it does in a moſt awkward manner. The Complutenſian edition has the ſame reading (except that with a great number of MSS. it has πρεσβυτερος for πρεσβυτης) and is thus very properly pointed: ὁ πρεσβυτερος, ὃν ειπατε, ετι ζῃ;—But perhaps the Aldine edition has a ſtill better reading, ὃν ειπατε ετι ζην; which is confirmed by not leſs than 21 of Holmes's MSS. and Caten. Nicet.—Two MSS. have in the ſame ſenſe ὁτι ζῃ, inſtead of ετι ζῃ; and one has ὁτι ετι ζῃ.—All theſe readings, when rightly pointed, are of the ſame import; and the only real difference is, that the reading ζῃ has more of the Hebraiſm, and ζην more of the Greek idiom. Houbigant has elegantly rendered the paſſage: "Recténe "eſt, inquit, patri veſtro ſeni, quem ſuperſtitem eſſe mihi dixiſtis?"

CHAP. XLIV.

Ver. 5. I CANNOT but here agree with Dr. Kennicott, that the Greek * has happily preſerved the words that are now wanting in both Heb. and Sam. but without which the text is lame; and muſt have been unintelligible to thoſe to whom the ſpeech was addreſſed †. But I cannot ſo readily ſubſcribe to what the good Doctor ſays afterwards; namely, that there ſeems no authority in the original for "conſidering the cup *uſed* by Joſeph for *divination.*" For I cannot think that the words והוא נחש ינחש בו can ever be rendered "Therefore he would cer-"tainly diſcover concerning it."—The words cannot, in my opinion, be better rendered than they are by Sep. *αυτος δε οιωνισμῳ οιωνιζεται εν αυτῳ.* Vulg. *in quo augurari ſolet:* and ſo equivalently moſt of the ancient verſions; even Gr. Ven.—Any other interpretation would, moſt probably, have never been thought of, but for the purpoſe of freeing Joſeph from the imputation of practiſing augury. But who will affirm, that Joſeph may not have practiſed augury in Egypt; or, at leaſt, made his ſteward addreſs his brethren according to the prejudices of the country? The Moſaic law againſt divination was not yet promulgated. I allow, however, that the Hebrew will bear another interpretation; viz. *Ipſe autem divinatione divinatus eſt de eo*‡; that is, "he has found out by divination that ye have ſtolen it." But this will not exculpate Joſeph from the imputation of real, or pretended, divination, any more than the former verſion: and, indeed he calls himſelf an eminent diviner, v. 15.—That a cup, σπονδειον ‖, was uſed in the ſacred rites of Egypt, we learn from Clem. Alex. Strom. vi. p. 633. ed. Sylburg. And Lucian, ſomewhere, rallies the Egyptians for making a divinity of ποτηριον §. The Greeks likewiſe drew omens and auguries from their ſacred libations. See Le Clerc's very judicious note on this paſſage.

* He ſhould have added Syr. and Vulg. † "Sermones abrupti ſunt (ſays Roſenmüller after Dathe) quoniam "præſupponitur fratres Joſephi facile intellecturos eſſe, quid ſibi velit procurator." If they did, they muſt have had an uncommonly quick apprehenſion. For what enigma is this? "Wherefore have ye rewarded evil for good? *Is* it not *it* "in which my lord drinketh." ‡ Noldius has given many examples in which the prepoſitive ב has the meaning of *de*; *of, concerning*, &c. But the moſt of them are reſolvable into another ſignification, and none of them in a conſtruction ſimilar to the preſent. ‖ The perſon who carried it in proceſſion was called στολιστης. § *Iſis* (in tabula) is repreſented with a cup in her hand.

Ver

Ver. 18. The ſpeech of Judah, in this and the following verſes, is in my opinion the moſt ſimple, and at the ſame time the moſt perſuaſive, piece of oratory that ever came from the lips of man. I have been in the habit of admiring it theſe forty years: yet my admiration increaſes, every time I read it. Let my readers, who have not attended to its beauties, compare it with the phalerated harangue which Joſephus ſubſtitutes for it, in his ſecond book of Antiquities, c. vi. ſect. 8. or with Steele's attempt to moderniſe it in one of his Tatlers *, and then ſay, if there be not as great a difference between them as between pure gold and glancing tinſel.

CHAP. XLV.

Ver. 1. *COULD not refrain himſelf*, &c. So Oreſtes, in Sophocles, 1180. at the moving ſpeech of Electra: Φευ! φευ! κ. τ. λ.

Ver. 7. The Hebrew words להחיות לכם לפליטה גדלה are in Sep. thus rendered: εκθρεψαι υμων† καταλειψιν μεγαλην, which might lead one to imagine that they muſt have read differently, and this was once my ſuſpicion: I now believe they had the ſame reading before them, but gave the phraſe an equipollent turn: as Jerom has done in his verſion: *et eſcas ad vivendum habere poſſitis:* which is ſtill farther from the literal meaning of the Hebrew.

Ver. 10. *Thou ſhalt dwell in the land of Goſhen*, &c. This is in ch. 47. 11. called the land of *Rameſes*: but what particular region of Egypt it was, has been much diſputed. That it was a country fit for paſturage, and on the eaſtern border of Egypt, is clear from the context: but it is not ſo clear what was then the eaſtern border of Egypt, or what were the weſtern limits of the land of Goſhen. The antient tranſlators throw little light on the ſubject, as they all retain the Hebrew word; ſave Saadias, who for Goſhen has אלסדיר. But in no deſcription of Egypt have I found any ſuch name. Stephanus has indeed a Σαδαλις, which he calls an Egyptian town: and which may have been the ſame with *Sadir;* for in the Arabic and Greek languages the letters *l* and *r* were interchangeable: but ſtill the ſituation of *Sadalis* is as uncertain as that of *Sadir*. Perhaps, when that part of Egypt which borders on Arabia is better known, ſuch a name or its veſtiges may yet be found.—The Greek Alexandrian tranſlators, who muſt have been acquainted with the geography of Egypt, have Γεσεμ‡ Αραβιας: and it was this which partly induced Michaëlis to place *Goſhen* on the ſide of Arabia. He thinks it extended from *Raphia* on the border of Paleſtine, to the vicinity of Heliopolis. To this opinion I willingly accede; but I would not carry the northern boundary farther than the *Tirbonis palus*, and extend the ſouthern boundary as far as *Mons Troicus*.—With reſpect to the name itſelf, I am inclined to think that the reading of Sep. Γεσεμ, גשם, is the original reading: which the latter Jews Chaldaized into גשן, or גושן ||. Were it certain, as I think it highly probable, that this part of Egypt were favoured with heavenly ſhowers §; I ſhould have little heſitation in affirming that גשֹם is the true reading. The *land of Geſem* would then be very properly denominated:

* See a ſenſible remark on this ſubject in *Commentaries and Eſſays*, vol. i. p. 279. † Compl. and 4 MSS. have υμιν. ‡ Only *one* MS. has Γεσεν. The Latin copies before Jerom had alſo *Geſem*. See the next note but one. || None of the oriental verſions have the word written with a *vau*, although the punctators have, from Hebrew analogy, inſerted a *holem* or ſome equivalent vowel-point. § See Harmer, vol. 4. p. 354, &c.

namely *a land of rain* *; in contradiſtinction to the reſt of Egypt, which was watered by the Nile: and this *land of rain* was a proper habitation for the Iſraelites, who were ſhepherds, and not agriculturiſts. It is remarkable that Heliodorus calls at leaſt a part of this tract βουκολεια or places fit for paſturage.

Ib. *That thou mayeſt be near to me*, &c. Whether Memphis, or Tanis, or, as I once thought, Heliopolis, were then the capital and royal city of Egypt, the land of Goſhen might well be ſaid to be nigh to it, as in all probability the paſturage ground reached, or very nearly reached, to the moſt eaſtern branch of the Nile on the north, and perhaps to On, or Heliopolis, on the ſouth. Comp. Exod. 1. 22. Beſides the word *near*, which might be rendered *nearer*, may be underſtood comparatively, with reſpect to the far greater diſtance of Chanaan.

Ver. 18. *The beſt of all the land of Egypt.* That is, the moſt proper for you, as ſhepherds: not the moſt fertile part of the country, as is generally ſuppoſed. *Better* and *worſe* are relative terms: and what would have been the *worſt* of the land for Egyptian farmers, was the *beſt* for the nomadical Iſraelites.

Ver. 19. *This, alſo, thou haſt my command to bid them do.* The preſent Text runs thus: ואתה צויתה † זאת עשו, rendered by Pagninus "Et tu juſſus es: hoc facite;" and by our Engliſh tranſlators: "Now thou art commanded, this do ye." I very much doubt of the propriety of this phraſeology and punctuation. The Septuagint ſeem to have read in their copy צוה or צו, and to have conſidered זאת as governed by it: Συ δε εντειλαι ταυτα· λαβειν αυτους‡ κ.τ.λ. The ſame reading, or perhaps תצוה, ſeems to have been that of Syr. and the Thargumiſts: ſo alſo equivalently, although more briefly, the Latin Vulg. "Præcipe etiam, ut tollant plauſtra, &c.—The Sam. copy reads צויתי without any variety of lection; and if it had alſo read עתה for אתה, I ſhould have been inclined to deem this the genuine text "Lo! I command: this do ye, &c." Perhaps the original reading was תצוה; which is equivalent to צו or צוה; and which may have been the reading which Sep. found in their copy.—At any rate, the meaning is fully expreſſed in my verſion; and as litterally as the idiom of our language permits.

Ver. 26. *His heart palpitated.* יפג לבו. The common rendering is "his heart fainted." Sep. εξεςη τη διανοια. ‖.—Onk. Saad. and Perſ. have terms that denote *heſitation*; no improper idea of Jacob's caſe.—Michaëlis: "Sein herz blieb aber kalt," *friguit cor ejus*; a meaning adopted by Dathe and Roſenmüller; ſupported by the Syr. verſion; and from a meaning which פוג has in the Syr. and Arabic dialects. But I cannot think that the news of Joſeph's being alive would *chill* the heart of Jacob. He might doubt, he might heſitate: but he could not be cold. I am perſuaded, then, that the ſignification of יפג is to be ſought in the Arabic נפג, which gives the very meaning wanted; namely that of *ſudden motion, palpitation.* Not badly, therefore, the Vulgate: "Quaſi de gravi ſomno *evigilatus*; tamen non credebat eis."

* Jerom ſaw this, although the etymology did not pleaſe him; becauſe, prepoſſeſſed in favour of his Hebrew, he deemed the reading of Sep. an errour. "Hic (ſays he, Q. Hebr.) *Arabiæ* additum eſt: in Hebræis enim voluminibus "non habetur: unde et error increbuit, quod terra *Geſſen* in Arabia ſit. Porro ſi, ut in noſtris codicibus eſt, per "extremum *m* ſcribitur GESEM (quod mihi nequaquam placet) terram ſignat *complutam.* GESEM enim in *imbrem* "vertitur." † Five MSS. have צותה: 4 have צוית: 1 has צות: and 1 צויתה. ‡ Compl. and 17 MSS. have αυτους. ‖ Alex. and 8 MSS. have ἡ διανοια.

CHAP.

CHAP. XLVI.

Ver. 21. I HAVE ſaid in Expl. N. that there is much confuſion in the various genealogies from Benjamin. I have made ſome feeble attempts to reconcile them, at leaſt in ſome reſpects, in my Critical Rem. on 1 Chron. 26. 38. I ſhall at preſent only obſerve that the ten names here mentioned are not probably the immediate ſons of Benjamin: and perhaps the order in Sep. is preferable to that in the Hebrew.—I now only deſire that *Ahi* and *Roſh* may be joined by a hyphen; as I believe them to be but one perſon.

Ver. 27. The addition in the Septuagint of *five* more perſons, than are in the Hebrew, has been conſidered as an interpolation from Chronicles; chiefly, I believe, on the authority of Jerom; whoſe reaſoning on the ſubject is, however, not very juſt *. On the other hand, it has been defended on the authority of Luke, as if Luke, or rather Stephen, *an inſpired evangeliſt*, or *protomartyr*, could not be wrong in his ſupputation. But this is in itſelf a feeble argument; and thus refuted by the ſame Jerom: "Quod ſi e contrario nobis opponitur, quomodo, in Acti-" bus Apoſtolorum, in concione Stephani dicatur apud populum, *ſeptuaginta quinque* animas " ingreſſas eſſe Ægyptum; facilis excuſatio eſt. Non enim debuit S. Lucas, qui ipſius hiſtoriæ " ſcriptor eſt, in gentes Actuum Apoſtolorum volumen emittens, contrarium aliquod ſcribere " adverſus eam Scripturam quæ jam fuerat gentibus divulgata: et utique majoris opinionis, " illo dumtaxat tempore, Septuaginta interpretum habebatur authoritas, quam Lucæ, qui " ignotus et vilis, et non magnæ fidei in nationibus ducebatur." Yet even here the father's reaſoning is more ſpecious than ſolid. For the queſtion is not, whether Luke quoted the Sep. or not: but whether *Stephen* in his ſpeech to the Jews uſed that verſion. If he uſed the Sep. verſion, in ſpeaking to Paleſtine Jews, it is a ſtrong preſumption that its computation was then acknowledged to be right: and indeed, I ſee not why it may not be here as right, as the Hebrew computation is with reſpect to the ſons of Benjamin: for ſurely we muſt admit a *prolepſis* with regard to them alſo; unleſs we affirm that they were born before Jacob went into Egypt.

Ver. 28. *To make him meet him in Goſhen.* The preſent Hebrew Text has להורת לפניו גשנה †; which Pagninus renders *ad præparandum ante ſe Ghoſen*: and our tranſlators "to direct his face " unto Goſhen:" and ſtill more literally Ainſworth, "to ſignify before him unto Goſhen."—The Sam. reading is not לקראות, as Roſenmüller has it; but להראות, which was alſo the reading of the Syr. tranſlator's copy; and perhaps that of Sep. and Onk. although they rendered not ſo litterally. Michaëlis imagined, from the verſion of Sep. συναντησαι αυτῳ, that they read לקראות, and is not unwilling to deem this the true reading: but *to ſee one another* being equivalent *to meet*, they might have read with Sam. which, with Houbigant and Dathe, I have followed in my verſion.

* See Q. Hebr. vol. ii. p. 543.

† Eight MSS. have להורות; 4 have להרות, and 6 have להרת.

CHAP. XLVII.

Ver. 12. *IN proportion to the number of their families.* לפי הטף, *ad os parvuli.* Sep. κατα στομα *. Vulg. *ſingulis.* Dathe: *pro numero capitum.* We might ſay, *according to the number of mouths.*

Ver. 21. *And the people he reduced into ſervitude.* I follow the Sam. lection העביד אתו לעבדים. Sep. τον λαον κατεδουλωσατο αυτῳ † εις παιδας. Vulg. *ſubjecitque eam Pharaoni, et cunctos populos ejus* ‡.—I have no heſitation in preferring this reading, which the context ſeems to require, to the preſent Hebr. העביר אתו לערים *he removed them to cities.* See Houbigant's Prolegomena and Notes; and what has been urged againſt him by Ravius.—See alſo an excellent Note in *Commentaries and Eſſays*, vol. 1. p. 280.

Ver. 31. *And Iſrael bowed himſelf, leaning on his ſtaff.* What thanks are not due to the Septuagint, for preſerving here, as in many other places, the true ſenſe of the original! The Text runs thus וישתחו ישראל על ראש המטה, which is commonly rendered: "And Iſrael bowed him-"ſelf upon the bed's head." Vulg. *Adoravit Iſrael* Deum, *converſus ad lectuli caput;* or as Jerom more briefly in Q. Heb. *Adoravit Iſrael ad caput lectuli*; on which he comments thus: "Quod ſcilicet, poſtquam ei juraverat filius, ſecurus de petitione quam rogaverat, adoravit Deum "contra caput lectuli ſui. Sanctus, quippe, et Deo deditus vir, oppreſſus ſenectute, ſic habebat "lectulum poſitum, ut ipſe jacentis habitus abſque ulla difficultate ad orationem eſſet paratus." —And this ſort of reaſoning has been adopted by moſt modern interpreters. Yet it is all a pure begging of the queſtion. For it is not ſaid that Jacob was in bed, or even indiſpoſed, when he ſent for Joſeph. His laſt ſickneſs is only announced in the next chapter. Nor is it at all probable that the adoration paid to Joſeph || was made in bed: the word וישתחו admits not ſuch a poſition. Whereas an old feeble man making an obeyſance on the top of his patriarchal *ſtaff*, or *ſceptre* הַמַּטֶּה, is quite natural; and no tranſlator could better expreſs the meaning of the whole comma than the Septuagint have done. Και προσεκυνησεν Ισραηλ επι το ακρον της ῥαβδου αυτου. Every word of the original is in favour of this verſion; and nothing againſt it but a different mode of pointing the word המטה.

CHAP. XLVIII.

Ver. 12. *THEY bowed themſelves.* So the Sam. וישתחוו, and ſo Sep. προσεκυνησαν, and Syr. סגדו; a more probable reading than the preſent Text וישתחו, and juſtly preferred by Michaëlis and Dathe, whoſe verſion of the whole verſe is: *Tum recedere eos paululum jubet Joſephus, ut ſubmiſſe* avum *venerarentur.*—After the young lads have received their grandfather's benediction, Joſeph withdraws them from between Jacob's knees, and makes them pay their reverence to him. The other verſions read in the ſing. and conſequently apply the term to Joſeph.

* Gr. Ven. litterally κατα σομα τϑ νηπιϑ. † Compl. with 8 MSS. ἑαυτῳ. ‡ The other verſions and Joſephus read as the preſent Hebr. and are followed by Dathe and Michaëlis. || For that it was paid to God; is another *petitio principii.*

Ver.

Ver. 15. *The God who hath tended me.* As a ſhepherd tends his flocks, האלהים הרעה אתי. So the Pſalmiſt, 23. 1. "The Lord is my ſhepherd."—Mankind are wont to borrow their metaphors chiefly from their own profeſſions. Hence ſo many alluſions in the Hebrew writings to a paſtoral life.

Ver. 19. *But the younger ſhall be greater, &c.* It is juſtly remarked by Roſenmüller, that this *prophetical benediction* (as he calls it) was not fulfilled in the time of Moſes: as in the two muſters made by him the tribe of Manaſſeh was conſiderably more numerous than that of Ephraim. It muſt therefore be referred either to the times of the Judges, when the tribe of Ephraim ſeems to have rivalled, in ſome ſort, the tribe of Judah; or to the days of Rehoboam, when they became the commanding tribe of the other ten, which then ſeparated themſelves from the houſe of David.—The diviſion of the Manaſſehites into two half tribes, might alſo contribute to the inferiority of both.

Ver. 22. *One portion.* שכם אחד. Some interpreters, among whom is Michaëlis, make this portion to be the place of *Sichem*, which Jacob's ſons deſtroyed on account of the rape of their ſiſter: and which might be denominated a *conqueſt* with reſpect to Jacob. Againſt this it has been objected, 1*mo*. That it is not probable that Jacob would call this a juſt conqueſt, ſince he every where elſe abominates the deed of his ſons. 2*do*. That Sichem belonged not to the *Amorites*, but to the *Hevites*.—Neither of theſe objections is formidable. For, in the firſt place, although Jacob diſapproved of the fraud and violence of Simeon and Levi, he might ſtill conſider Sichem as a conqueſt. He moſt certainly winked at his ſon's proceedings; and ſeems to have been more ſolicitous about his own ſafety, than concerned for the ſlaughter of the Sichemites. See ch. 35. 30. And he had ſurely as good a claim to the ground where Sichem ſtood, as he had to the "herds and flocks, the little ones and the wives" of its inhabitants. Ib. v. 28. 29. As then we read of no other conqueſt made by Jacob, we have a right to ſuppoſe that this is that here alluded to: and we actually find *Sichem* and its environs a part of the inheritance of the Joſephites. Notwithſtanding all this, I would not with Michaëlis, and even on the authority of Sep*. (whom I am always loth to abandon) inſert *Sichem* in the Text; becauſe I am perſuaded that שכם is here not a proper name, but an appellative noun, whether we derive it from the Arab. שכם *a gift*, or the Hebr. שכם *a ſhoulder*. Yet ſtill, I think, it alludes to *Sichem*; to a part of which Jacob had a fair claim by purchaſe, ch. 34. 19. —and where the bones of Joſeph were interred, Joſh. 24. 32.—As to the objection ariſing from the name of *Amorites*, we know that this was a much more extenſive name than that of *Hevites*, and might include the latter. If this ſatisfy not; we muſt ſuppoſe that, after the flight of Jacob from Sichem, ſome Amorites tribe took poſſeſſion of the place, and were afterwards expelled by Jacob: although we no where read of that expulſion. See my Explanatory Note.

* Εγω δε διδωμι σοι Σικιμα, εξαιρετον ὑπερ τους αδελφους σου.—Better Gr. Ven. Εγω δ εδωκα σοι μεριδα μιαν, επι τοις σοις αδελφοις.

CHAP.

CHAP. XLIX.

ALTHOUGH this chapter has had more commentators than perhaps any other ſingle portion of Hebrew Scripture, it muſt be confeſſed that it has not hitherto been illuſtrated ſo ſatisfactorily, as to exclude further elucidation. In theſe Remarks I ſhall leſs indulge myſelf in criticiſing my predeceſſors, than in endeavouring to defend my own Verſion: which I have made, regardleſs of ſyſtem, and, I think, devoid of every ſort of prejudice. But, firſt of all, I muſt declare that I do not believe it to be the real compoſition of Jacob, but of ſome Hebrew bard, who lived poſterior to Joſhuah, perhaps poſterior to David. That Jacob may have bleſſed his children, and accommodated his reſpective benedictions to the known bent and diſpoſition of each, is highly probable: but that he ſhould accord his benedictions to the future ſituation of the tribes, will not readily be believed by thoſe who have critically and philoſophically examined the ſubject*.

Ver. 3. There is no difficulty, or diſpute, with reſpect to the firſt comma: but the ſecond, which I render "the prime of my might," is in the Latin Vulg. "principium doloris mei," *the beginning of my ſorrow*. But this rendering has been abandoned by moſt interpreters; and is indeed unſuitable to the context. Syr. Chald. Perſ. Ar. Erp. and Gr. Ven. all took אוני for *ſtrength*. And Sep. has equivalently, though figuratively, αρχη τεκνων† μου. Jacob was in the vigour of his life, when he begot Reuben: and to this all the epithets evidently allude. The next colon יתר שאת ויתר עז is ſtill more variouſly interpreted. Sep. σκληρος φερεσθαι, και σκληρος αυθαδης: a meaning of which, in my apprehenſion, the Hebrew words are not ſuſceptible.—Vulg. "prior in donis, major in imperio;" and ſo Matthew "chief in receiving, and chief in "power," *i. e.* the chief portion of his father's goods, and the chief dominion among his brethren: and this I take to be the virtual meaning of the words; although not their litteral import: "ſuperior in dignity, ſuperior in power," for this laſt word is here more proper than *ſtrength*; which ſtands in my Verſion. Moſt of the Ant. interpreters coincide in this meaning: although ſome of them are too wild paraphraſes, particularly Onkelos and the Thargums. The ſenſe is not badly expreſſed by Gr. Ven. περισσειας του αιρειν, περισσειας τε κραταιου.

Ver. 4. *Like water, thou haſt lapſed.* In the preceding verſe Jacob expreſſes in ſtrong terms what Reuben was, or ſhould have been by nature and birth: in the preſent he paints his degraded condition, and the cauſe of it, in lively colours. The preſent Text reads thus פחז כמים אל תותר: but with Houbigant, Dathe, Michaëlis, Durell, &c. I prefer the Sam. read. פחזת, which was that of almoſt all the Ant. interpreters; although they conſiderably differ in its meaning. Sep. Εξυβρισας. Vulg. "Effuſus es," and ſo equivalently Syr. Onk. Perſ. which, I have no doubt, is the genuine meaning. All Reuben's former preeminence lapſed away like

* "Non probabile eſt, carmen hoc iiſdem verbis, quibus in hoc capite continetur, coram filiis recitatum eſſe a Jacobo moribundo. Sine dubio unus filiorum Jacobi, aut alius quidam, ſummam eorum, quæ prædixerat ſenex Jacobus, in carminis hujus formam redegit, ut hujus prædictionis memoria in poſteros perſtaret; utque ipſi horum dictorum memoriam recitatione recolere poſſent." Schultze in locum.—This is granting much; but, in my opinion, not enough. See J. H. Heinrichs *De Auctore atque Ætate Capitis Geneſ.* XLIX. Gotting. 1790. † Compl. and 2 MSS. των τεκνων.

water,

water, when he defiled his father's couch. Some moderns give another meaning to פחזת derived from the Arabic; namely "Thou haſt ſwelled like water," i. e. *tumuiſti inſtar aquarum:* which nearly correſponds with the εξυβρισας of Sep.—Michaëlis is, I believe, ſingular in his verſion, "Du biſt raſend unſinnig geworden."—*Thou art become furious and mad!*—Thoſe who prefer the preſent Hebr. reading may render with our common tranſlation: *unſtable* (or *light*) *as water*, &c. *Fugax ut aqua.* See my Explan. Note.

Ib. *Then waſt thou degraded, when thou aſcendedſt my couch.* אז חללת' יצועי עלה. Which Pagninus thus barbarouſly tranſlates: *Tunc polluiſti, ſtratum meum aſcendit*; and our Tranſlators: "Then defiledſt thou *it:* he went up to my couch;" and in the margin, "my couch is gone," which if any one underſtand without a violent commentary, I ſhall much wonder.—Let us now ſee how the antients have ſucceeded. Sep. τοτε εμιανας την στρωμνην, ὁυ ανεβης. Vulg. has only: *Et maculaſti ſtratum ejus.* The other verſions are embarraſſed and ambiguous: except that the Samaritan and Saadias lead to the right reading of חללת, which is here in a paſſive ſignification and ſhould be thus pointed חֻלַלְתָּ *profanatus es:* Then read עלה or עֹלֶה; and the litteral verſion will be, *Tunc profanatus es, cubile meum aſcendens,* which I have equivalently expreſſed in my verſion.

Ver. 5. *Who accompliſhed their iniquitous machinations*; כלי חמס מכרתיהם, which our Tranſlators render, "Inſtruments of cruelty *are in* their habitation:" and in the margin, "Their "ſwords are weapons of violence." Purver: "Whoſe bargains were with inſtruments of vio-"lence." Green: "Their engagements were inſtruments of cruelty." All theſe endeavoured to make ſome ſenſe or other out of the preſent Hebrew. But the Sam. copy has כלו, not כלי; and ſo read Sep. συνετελεσαν αδικιαν εξαιρεσεως * αυτων, and ſo Onk. עבדו. This reading, with Durell, Dathe, Houbigant and Michaëlis, I prefer; and have rendered accordingly.

Ib. *Their iniquitous machinations.* Lit. "the iniquity of their machinations"—or "ſtratagems" as Durell renders. The word occurs but once, and has been variouſly tranſlated: "But of "all the interpretations of it (ſays Durell) that of *habitation* is the leaſt juſtifiable: for there is "no ſufficient authority for that ſignification; which at beſt makes but a bad ſenſe; and has "the inconvenience (in common with the next to be mentioned) that there muſt be a prepo-"ſition ſupplied. The ſenſe of *ſwords* (continues the ſame judicious writer) given to it is bor-"rowed from the Chald. מכירא, which the Rabbins having evidently borrowed from the Greek "μαχαιρα; it cannot for that reaſon be admitted." To all this I heartily ſubſcribe—and have only to add, that the meaning of *eſpouſals* or *affiances* given to מכרתי by Le Clerc, and adopted by Dathe, is in my opinion inadmiſſible. I would not however derive the word from either the Ethiopic or Arabic. I think the meaning is eaſily drawn from the Hebrew כרה *fodere*; but in a metaphorical and poetical ſenſe. Thus the Pſalmiſt, 57. 7: כרו לפני שיחה.—*They dug a pit for me*, i. e. they *laid ſnares.*

Ver. 6. *They maſſacred men.* הרגו איש. The word איש is in the ſingular: but, as Durell well obſerves, it "is frequently uſed for any number of men; though it is nearly a matter of "indifference, which of the two numbers we here adopt. The ſingular anſwers more exactly

* Ald. Alex. and 8 of Holmes's MSS. read εξ αιρεσεως.

"to

"to *chief* in the next line: but the plural repreſents in a ſtronger light the murder of all the "males" of Sichem, here alluded to. So Dathe: *viros trucidarunt;* and Michaëlis: "männer." So before them, Sep. ανθρωπους.

Ib. *Extirpated a chief.* The Hebrew is עקרו שור, which is rendered by Sep. ενευροκοπησεν ταυρον, *They ham-ſtrung*, or *boughed, a bull* *. Vulg. *ſuffoderunt murum.* And this is the meaning moſt generally affixed to שור. Herder and ſome others have defended the Septuagint verſion thus: A *bull* is not here a *real bull*, but a metaphor denoting a *chief*; in contraſt with איש the vulgar *man* †. Teller imagined that שור, in the ſenſe of *a wall*, might have a ſimilar metaphorical meaning ‡. I would rather, with Durell and Houbigant, either read שר, or give to שור the ſame ſignification; namely a *prince* or *chief*, deſignating here the *chief* of the Sichemites.

Ver. 10. We are now come to a paſſage, on which more labour has been beſtowed than perhaps on any other paſſage of the Bible. It has been generally conſidered by Chriſtians, at leaſt from the days of Origen, as relating to Jeſus Chriſt, the *Meſſiah*. But were this the caſe, it is ſtrange that neither Chriſt himſelf, nor any of his apoſtles, ſhould ever have thought of its application. Indeed this has long appeared to me, to be one of thoſe groundleſs aſſumptions, for which there is not the ſlighteſt proof; as, I truſt, I ſhall be able to ſhew in the ſequel of this Remark.

As the explanation of the whole paſſage chiefly depends on the meaning of one word, שילה, SHILOH; let us endeavour to find that meaning. And firſt, let us ſee how the word has been rendered by the antient interpreters.—Sep. τα αποκειμενα αυτω, in the four printed editions, and in moſt of the Greek Fathers: but 3 MSS. with Copt. have ὁ αποκειται αυτω. Seven have only ὁ αποκειται: and 15 MSS. in the Text, and 3 in the margin, have ᾧ αποκειται; which, according to Juſtin Mart. and ſome other Greek Fathers, was the original reading of Sep. and rendered by the Latins *cui repoſitum eſt*, or *cui reſervatum eſt* ‖. This was alſo the reading of Aquila and Symmachus.—Syr. מן דדילה הי *to whom it* (the ſceptre) *belongs*.—Onk. משיחא דדיליה היא מלכותא—*The Meſſiah* §, *whoſe is the kingdom.* So equivalently both the Thargums and Perſ.—Saadias אלדי הו לה, in the ſame meaning with Syr.—Arab. Erp. and Gr. Ven. retain the Hebrew word שילה, Σιλων.—Singular is the rendering of the Latin Vulgate: *qui mittendus eſt*, "who is "to be ſent." The tranſlator ſeems to have read in his copy שילח or שלוח; a *Heth* for a *He:* and this reading was preferred by Helvicus, Grotius, and ſome others: but is now generally given up; even by the Roman Catholic interpreters.—Let us next ſee how the moderns have acquitted themſelves.

They may be divided into two claſſes—Thoſe who conſider the word שילה as a compound, and thoſe who deem it a radical, or ſimple derivative.—It is not my intention to give a

* So our firſt tranſlators, *boughed an ox*; and the marginal reading of our public verſion, *boughed oxen.* But what probability is there that Simeon and Levi would hough their own prey, to be avenged of the Sichemites?—It is, however, remarkable, that Gr. Ven. has απερριζωσατην βουν. † This is the more plauſible, as אלף has the ſame double meaning. But ſtill it accords with my interpretation. ‡ As Hector might be called the *wall*, or *bulwark*, of Troy: and Achilles the *wall* of the Greeks—*Graiûm murus Achilles.* ‖ There are ſome other varieties, which the reader, if he pleaſe, may ſee in Holmes's Collection. § Or *anointed.*

minute

minute detail of all the writers who have commented upon the paſſage; nor all the various ſyſtems that have been invented to illuſtrate it: I will only give a brief account of the preſent ſtate of the queſtion; with reſpect to the two claſſes of interpreters juſt mentioned.

Thoſe of the firſt claſs, who think that שילה, שלה or שילו, is the ſame with שלו, and that שלו is compoſed of ש (the abbreviation of אשר) and לו the dative of the third perſonal pronoun; coincide in their interpretation with moſt of the antient tranſlators, and render either *cujus eſt*, or *cui eſt*; ſupplying either *ſceptrum*, or *regnum*, or *jus*, or ſome ſuch word: as if the meaning of the comma were "until he come, whoſe *the ſceptre*, or *kingdom*, or *right* is:" or "to whom *the ſceptre*, *kingdom* or *right* appertaineth." And this the Jews generally apply to David; the Chriſtians as generally to Jeſus Chriſt.

This hypotheſis, or mode of interpretation, is neatly abridged by the writer of *Commentaries and Eſſays*, vol. 1. p. 281, who ſums up his arguments thus: "The *jod* being excluded from "שילה, and the *vau* reſtored, we ſhall have the proper pronoun maſculine שלו, compounded of "אשר לה; and the ſenſe of the paſſage will be:" 'The ſceptre ſhall not depart from Judah, "nor a law-giver from between his feet (from among his poſterity) until he come whoſe (*i. e.* "the ſceptre) is' or 'to whom it belongs,' agreeable to the verſion of the old Κοινη—ᾧ "ἀποκεῖται *."

To this it has been objected that the abbreviation of אשר into ש was unknown in the time of Moſes, there not being another example of it in the whole Pentateuch, if we except the conteſted בשגם of Gen. 6. 3. To me, who am perſuaded that the laſt words of Jacob were put into their preſent poetical garb long after Moſes, this is no great objection. The abbreviation in queſtion is found in the book of Judges, not only in poetry, but alſo in proſe. See Jud. 5. 7.—7. 12.—8. 26.—But there are other objections which militate more powerfully againſt this explanation. 1*mo*. The reading שלו is ſupported by only 3 MSS. and theſe even have not שלו but שילו. That the ה and ו, from their great reſemblance in the old Hebrew characters, have been by ignorant or careleſs tranſcribers frequently interchanged, is certain: but that the antient Hebrews ever uſed the maſculine and feminine pronouns indiſcriminately, is alleged without ſufficient proof. In the Sam. copy of the Pentateuch there is not, I think, a ſingle inſtance. And, indeed, it is my firm belief, that whereſoever in the Hebrew text we find ה for ו as an affix, or *vice verſa*, it is a corruption: whatever Buxtorf and his diſciples may urge to the contrary. But, 2*do*,

Were it even granted that שילה and שילו, or even שלה and שלו without the *jod*, were the ſame; and that שלו were an abbreviated compound of אשר לו, ſuch an *ellipſis*, as muſt here be admitted, is not, I think, to be found in the whole Scripture. The inſtance from Ezekiel, 21. 27. is not to the purpoſe; for there the nominative המשפט makes the ſentence complete and the meaning clear: and to ſay that the nominative to יבא is here to be taken from the preceding comma, is to beg the queſtion. Beſides, the meaning ariſing from this interpretation, if the paſſage be applied to Chriſt, is inadmiſſible, as Roſenmüller properly remarks. "Quod ſenſus effici-"tur, qui nullo modo admitti poteſt: reges enim Iſraelitarum è tribu Judæ orti multa ante "Chriſtum natum ſæcula deſierunt: et poſtquam Iſraelitæ ſeſe à Perſarum et Græcorum po-

* So alſo Michaëlis: "dem es gebührt." and Green: "until he, whoſe *right* it is, ſhall come."

"teſtate liberaverunt, habebant illi reges è tribu Levi; et poſt eos adeo regem peregrinum nacti "ſunt, Herodem Magnum, quo regnante natus eſt Jeſus. Hi omnes reges ne in urbe quidem "in tribu Judæ ſitâ, ſed Hieroſolymæ in tribu Benjamin, ſedes habebant."—Accordingly,

The Jewiſh interpreters, who take שילה to be the ſame with שלו, apply it, with greater propriety, to David, who was the firſt king of the tribe of Judah: for the words עד כי imply not *diſcontinuance*, but only *the arrival of an event*: as we ſhall ſee more plainly afterwards.

Others make שילה, i. e. (ſay they) שילו, a compound of שׁ *gifts* and לו *to him*: as if the meaning of the Text were "until he come, to whom gifts "*are due*." So Jarhi, who, however, calls it a *myſtical expoſition*, and prefers the interpretation of Onkelos.

Le Clerc imagined that שלה was a compound of של, from the Chald. שלה *finire*, and of ה for ו; and rendered "donec veniat finis ejus: i. e. *Judæ*:" a verſion juſtly objected to by Houbigant; and ridiculed by the Jews of Metz. "Our holy patriarch (ſay they) if we believe "M. Le Clerc, was filled with the ſpirit of prophecy, to teach us, *That Judah was to have the "ſovereign power, until—he ſhould not have it*."—Indeed Le Clerc, as far as I know, made no proſelytes to his opinion.

Durell, ſuppoſing that *Judah* here means not the *patriarch* of the tribe, but the *land* of Judah, and שלה to be a compound of שׁ (for אשר), and לה, the dative of the feminine affix, renders the whole verſe thus:

"The ſceptre ſhall not depart from *the land of* Judah,
"Nor a leader from her ſtandards *,
"Before HE come who *belongeth* to her:
"And him ſhall the nations obey."

By this mode of interpretation the ſoleciſm is evidently removed; but a meaning is forced upon the Text, which, in my opinion, it cannot bear. To confound *Judah* with the *land of Judah* is here prepoſterous: and ſuch an expreſſion could not, with any degree of propriety, be put in the mouth of Jacob, even by poetical licence.

Ludovicus-de-Deo imagined that שיל, from the Arabic, ought to be rendered *profluvium*: and thus שילה, for שילו, will be *profluvium ejus*; that is, *his iſſue*.

Come we now to thoſe interpreters, who conſider שילה as a radical term, or as a ſimple derivative.

Aben-Ezrah, the moſt learned and acute of all the Jewiſh commentators, took שילה to be the name of the place, where the Convention-tent or Tabernacle was erected after the conqueſt of Chanaan, Joſh. 18. 1. and renders the comma thus: "until Shiloh be at an end; *or* "ceaſe to be." For then, ſays he, David reigned. Delgado turns the ſame idea another way: his verſion of the whole verſe is: "The ſceptre ſhall not depart from Judah, nor a law-giver from "between his feet, *until Shiloh be gone down*; and even then he ſhall have an aſſembly of "people"—which he thus explains: "Judah having the ruling-ſtaff in his hand, continued in "that prerogative till the ark of the Lord was taken by the Philiſtines, when the tabernacle "of Shiloh was put down. Then the command was taken from Judah, and he may be ſaid to

* He follows the Sam. reading.

"have

" have couched as a lion, as in ver. 9. and ſoon after the reſtoration of the ark, a king was choſen " of the tribe of Benjamin, which was Saul: yet then, even during Saul's reign, David ſprang up, " and was privately elected king by Samuel; and being purſued by Saul, a company of men " aſſembled to him, whoſe number ſoon increaſed to 600. And, perhaps, the end of this " verſe may allude to that event."—Certainly ingenuity is not here wanting, whatever we may think of the writer's ſyſtem.

The learned Teller is alſo of opinion that שילה is here the name of a place; but makes it, not the nominative, but the objective caſe: and renders, *uſque dum venerit Schiluntem.*"—" until he come to Shiloh." This is a very ſpecious verſion. The want of the final ה denoting motion to a place is no objection. It is frequently omitted; and even in the very ſame word, and with the very ſame verb, 1 Sam. 4. 12. ויבא שלה " and came to Shiloh."—Doctor Prieſtley, I remember, was ſo pleaſed with this interpretation, that he was convinced it was the only true one.

It did not pleaſe Hufnagel, who in Eichhorn's *Biblical Repertory** labours to prove that the words יבא שלה ſhould be rendered *quia venit amans*; or, as he expreſſes it in German, " be- " cauſe with love he [Judah] begins his courſe†." His argument in favour of this verſion is, that Jacob having given reaſons for his predictions to Reuben, and to Simeon and Levi, drawn from their reſpective merits and diſpoſitions, it is not probable that he would not, in like manner, qualify his prediction to Judah. This appears to me a very weak argument. In qualifying with a *wherefore* his predictions to Reuben and to Simeon and Levi, Jacob appeals to known facts; whereas we nowhere read that Judah's love for his father was more conſpicuous than that of Joſeph, or of any other of his brethren. If any pre-eminence of this kind were to be implied from facts, it would ſeem to belong to Reuben: for he alone laboured to reſcue Jacob's beloved ſon, and to reſtore him to his father; when all his other brothers were plotting his deſtruction‡. All the length that Judah's love on this trying occaſion went, was to commute the *death* of Joſeph into *ſlavery*.

Beſides, in order to form his verſion, Hufnagel wreſts from the words unuſual meanings, contrary to grammatical analogy, and the rules of Hebrew ſyntax. For in the firſt place, עד כי never ſignifies, cannot ſignify *propterea, becauſe.* Secondly, he affixes a meaning to שלה which cannot be drawn from it, whatſoever way it be pointed (he points שִׁלָה) or from whatſoever root it be derived. Laſtly, *quia venit amans*, in the ſenſe annexed to it by Hufnagel, is, in my apprehenſion, an expreſſion ſo harſh and unidiomatical, that this alone would make me reject his interpretation.

According to ſome modern commentators, שילה here is the ſame with שליה in Deut. 28. 57. and both from the Chald. שלה or the Arabic סלי; which denote either the *ſecundines*, or the *membrane* that incloſes the fœtus: but here taken for the *fœtus* itſelf: a *noble* metonymy, truly! either with reſpect to Judah or his offspring. " The ſceptre ſhall not depart, &c. until " the *ſecundines* come."—I wonder how this etymon could be adopted by Dathe‖; who, however,

* Tom. xiv. p. 235, &c. † Denn er beginnt mit liebe ſeinen lauf. ‡ See Gen. 37. 22. 30.
‖ " Vera ſcriptio vocis adeo controverſæ eſt שלה ſine *Jod*. . . . Eſt autem ab Arabico סלי, quod notat membranam, qua " involutus

ever, gives a new turn to the comma, by giving a new meaning to עד־כי, which he renders *quamdiu*; *as long as*. "Quamdiu prolem habebit, ei gentes obedient."

Luther, Caſtalio, Oleaſter, Houbigant, and ſome others, more rightly in my opinion, derive the word from שלה *proſperity, tranquillity, happineſs*; and render *quietus, pacificus, ſoſpitator, pacificator, tranquillator*, or ſome ſimilar term: all epithets applicable, ſay they, to Chriſt, or the Meſſiah; *the author of peace, tranquillity, and happineſs*. Schultens, with his uſual ſubtlety, finds the root in the Arab. שלו *liquavit*; and in a ſecondary ſenſe, *ad liquidam tranquillitatem confuſa et fæcata revocavit*.

Without any *refinement* or *ſtraining* of the word, I too take שלה in its certain, acknowledged acceptation*. Whether it be written שלה, שילה, or שלו, I am not much concerned: although I am inclined to think that the laſt is the true reading; becauſe it was that of almoſt all the Ant. verſions: and becauſe it is here in the maſculine gender; as in Job, 20. 20. Yet all the Sam. copies with 38 Heb. MSS. and one printed edition have שלה: which, as ה is radical, may alſo be a maſculine. The word is in ſome other places written שלוה; and once, Prov. 1. 32. שלות with a feminine verb. Making שלה then the nominative to יבא, I render it *peaceful proſperity*†; and refer it to that period when, "the land being at reſt," the Tabernacle was ſet up at *Shiloh*; which, doubtleſs, had its name from this very circumſtance. Every part of the benediction is now clear, and conform to the rules of grammar. The harſh ellipſis is done away: the common ſignification of every term is preſerved; and the whole is a beautiful prayer or prophecy, adapted to actual events and occurrences relative to the tribe of Judah. I ſay *prayer* or *prophecy*, becauſe the words may be conſidered either as *precative* or *predictive*: and perhaps "May the ſceptre, &c." would be a more proper verſion than "The ſceptre ſhall not, &c." Jacob then wiſhes, or foretels, that Judah ſhall not be without a patriarchal ſceptre-wielding chief, until the Iſraelites be put in poſſeſſion of the promiſed land, and enjoy peace and proſperity. A ſimilar wiſh is expreſſed by the good old man in ver. 18. "O Lord! from thee I wait for ſalvation!" which I am inclined to think ſtood originally in ver. 10. and made a part of the benediction of Judah. See Explan. Note.—Be this as it may, the whole tenor of the benediction leads to the meaning which I have given.

But what, then, becomes of the Meſſiah? Become of him what will, I confeſs I cannot here find a veſtige of him: nor did the Meſſiah himſelf, nor any of his apoſtles or evangeliſts, apply this text to him; which is wonderful indeed, if they looked upon it as applicable: they who apply to him ſo many other Texts, which can, at moſt, refer to him in only a ſecondary and tralatitious ſenſe. In A. B. Secker's MS. Notes I found an obſervation ſo judicious on this ſubject, that I cannot withhold it from my readers. "If the Meſſiah (ſays he) be here promiſed to "ſpring from Judah, how could God propoſe to deſtroy Iſrael, and make a nation of Moſes?"

"involutus eſt fœtus cum hominis tum pecudis; cujus forma fœminina extat, Deut. 28. 57. et metonymice pro ipſo "fœtu recens nato, aut tenera prole, ponitur: ex quo שלי, vel שלה, vel של per apocopen, ad formam בן, fit, cum "affixo, שלה *proles, ſoboles ejus*." This explanation, as modified by Dathe, belongs to the former claſs. * I believe it nearly the ſame with the Latin *ſalus*; which is probably derived from it. † The word is rendered *proſperity* more than once in our common verſion. See Pſ. 30. 6.—122. 7.—Prov. 1. 32.—Jerem. 22. 21.

Exod.

Exod. 32. 10. and Deut. 9. 14—14. 12. And, indeed, if this divine menace had taken place, the Meſſiah would not have ſprung from Judah, but from Levi: although he would ſtill have been the ſeed of Abraham, Iſaac, and Jacob: to whom the promiſe is every where elſe ſuppoſed to have been made.

Having thus diſpoſed of *Shiloh*, let us reſume, and briefly explain the other words of the verſe.

The word שבט, which I have rendered "*ſceptred chief*," in its more ſimple ſignification ſignifies a *rod* or *ſtaff*: which was the enſign of patriarchal power, as a *ſceptre* was afterwards that of regal power. The Hebrew שבט ſeems to have been a long pointed ſtaff, ſuch as we would call a *pikeſtaff*: and indeed we find the word ſometimes denoting a *ſpear**. From being the enſign of a tribual chief, it came to ſignify the chief himſelf, who wielded it, and even the tribe of which he was the chief. I take it here in the former of theſe ſecondary acceptations, on account of the paralleliſm.

The word which I have rendered "*a leader*," מחקק, is commonly tranſlated *a law-giver*: but it denotes rather one who *directs* and *ordains* the keeping of laws already made, than an immediate legiſlator. The patriarchal chiefs had the *direction* and *leading* of their reſpective tribes; and perhaps might make local and occaſional regulations: but they were not, properly ſpeaking, *law-givers*.

In rendering the next word, רגליו, I have followed the common Hebrew reading: although it muſt be owned that the Sam. reading דגליו, followed by Houbigant, Durell, and ſome others, is very plauſible. But all the antients ſeem to have read as the preſent Hebrew. Sep. εκ των μηρων αυτου. Vulg. *de femore ejus*: and ſo equivalently the reſt.

The word עד־כי, which I render *until*, does not mean that then Judah ſhall ceaſe to have a *ſceptred chief*: but merely that he ſhall not be without one, *until proſperity come*. Until that happy time, Judah was to take the lead among the tribes of Iſrael, and to be principally conducive to the conqueſt of Chanaan, and the peaceful proſperity of the Hebrew nation. Accordingly we find the ſtandard and camp of Judah moving "forward the firſt," by the Lord's command, Num. 2. 9. And when after the death of Joſhuah the Lord was aſked: "Who ſhall "go the firſt, to make war againſt the Chanaanites?" the Lord anſwers: "Let Judah go: "for lo! into his hands I deliver the land." Jud. 1. 1, 2. The ſame anſwer is given, when it was queſtion of making war on the Benjaminites, Jud. 20. 18.—And all this perfectly well explains the laſt member of the preſent verſe, "And to him the nations ſhall† be obedient:" eſpecially if by the word *nations*, עמים, be meant the other *tribes*: which meaning the context here ſeems to require.—There is a various reading in the Sam. copy, יקהתו‡ inſtead of יקהת: which Sam. reading is preferred by Houbigant and Teller. I ſuſpect the original reading to have been יקהת העמים; but it is of very little importance, as the meaning is all the ſame. The word יקה ſignifies that *voluntary* and *ſubmiſſive obedience*, which is paid to thoſe in whom we confide: ſuch as we may ſuppoſe was paid by the other tribes to that of Judah.

* We have two Saxon words which, in my conception, ſtill retain the etymon: *ſpit* and *ſtaff*. The former is the pure Hebrew word; and which in Iſlandic denotes a *ſpear*: and the latter is the ſame word from a tranſpoſition of letters; at firſt *ſtab*, and now *ſtaff*. † This word has been, I know not how, omitted in the text of my Verſion. ‡ Nine Sam. MSS. have יקחתו.

But

But although, every circumſtance conſidered, I think it moſt probable, that the poet had in view the period which I have mentioned: yet it may be, that the end of David's reign is alluded to; when Judah was in high proſperity, and all the *nations* round ſubdued, and paying tribute to the king of Iſrael.

Ver. 11. *To the vine he ſhall tie his aſs.* In thoſe eaſtern countries the vines have large ſtems. Chardin ſaw ſome in Perſia, which he could hardly graſp. After the vintage is over, the cattle feed on the leaves and tendrils.—This and the following verſe give us a moſt graphic picture of the fertility of that tract which fell to the tribe of Judah, abounding in vineyards and fine paſturage.—There indeed, we find the vale of *Eſhchol*, whence the ſpies, Num. 13. 23. brought a cluſter of grapes that needed to be carried by two men on a pole—there the vineyards of *Engedi*, celebrated in the Song of Solomon: and as to paſturage, the mountainous parts, or the wilderneſs of Judah, were as famous, as its vales were for vines. It was there that the rich Nabal had his flocks. See 1 Sam. 25. 2.

Ver. 13. *Zebulon by a haven of the ſea ſhall dwell.* Michaëlis in his Supplem. ad Lex. Hebr. has laboured to prove that חוף ſignifies not a *haven*, but a *ſhore:* and ſo indeed all the Ant. tranſlators ſeem to have underſtood it. Sep. παραλιος. Vulg. *in littore.* Onk. על ספר. Syr. and Tharg. על ספרי. Saad. פי שאחל. Ar. Erp. שאחל. Perſ. בכנארי. Gr. Ven. εις αιγιαλον.—Notwithſtanding all this maſs of authority, I ſtill think that חוף here means a *haven:* or if it mean a *ſhore*, it means a ſhore with a haven at it. Every haven is a ſhore, although every ſhore be not a haven: and a number of havens on our own coaſts are denominated ſhores: *Shore of Yarmouth, Shore of Scarborough, Shore of Leith, Shore of Banff, Shore of Buckie,* &c. —It is clear from what follows that the Shore of Zebulon was a ſhore of this kind; becauſe we are told it was "a ſhore for ſhips," והוא לחוף אניות. Hence in rendering this laſt comma, Sep. has παρ' ὁρμον (3 MSS. ὁρμων) πλοιων: and the Greek of Venice, εις λιμενα νεων. So Vulg. *in ſtatione navium.*—The Hebrew word itſelf is yet apparent in the Scoto-Saxon *hyf* or *hyve*, and in the Engliſh *havn* or *haven:* and ſtill more ſo in the Scottiſh *houf;* which ſignifies a *place of reſort, retreat* and *ſecurity:* and the German *hof* is moſt probably of the ſame origin.—The objection to the derivation of חוף from חפף is, in my opinion, frivolous: for many other words are formed in the ſame manner: as אום, און, בוק, גול, חול, חום, חוק &c. unleſs it be ſaid, that theſe are rather derived from *verbs quieſcent* of the ſame purport, although not generally in uſe; to which I have no objection: only let me extend the ſame privilege to חפף. For who will affirm that the Hebrews, eſpecially in poetry, may not have uſed חוף in the ſame meaning with חפף; although we have no other example of it?—I have only to add, that I conſider והוא in the laſt comma to be the relative to the former חוף, and not to זבולן: ſo that the comma might be rendered: "and that *haven* ſhall be a haven (or harbour) for ſhips."

Ver. 14. Very little help is derived from moſt of the antient verſions for the explanation of this paſſage. The words חמר גרם, or as 15 MSS. חמור גרם, are rendered by Sep. το καλον επεθυμησεν. How they read in their copy, it is not eaſy to gueſs. Some critics imagine that their Text had חמוד *deſirable*, inſtead of חמור *an aſs*; and that they took גרם in the ſenſe of the Arab. غرم *concupivit.* I am rather inclined to think, that they read חמד גדים *deſired good things*, taking גדים for the plural of גד, and this in the ſame ſenſe as it is uſed by Leah, Gen. 30. 13. What gives the greater plauſibility to this is the Sam. reading גרים, which they might readily

readily have miſtaken for נדים, or which might itſelf have been interchanged with נדים by copyiſts poſterior to the Septuagint. Yet what is ſtill more remarkable, the Perſic tranſlator, at a much later period, ſeems to have had before him a ſimilar reading, or made the ſame miſtake; as he renders תואנגר במאל *great in wealth:* and, before him Onkelos עתיר בנכסין *ditatus opibus.* Could either of them have poſſibly drawn ſuch a meaning from the preſent Hebrew, or even the preſent Sam. reading?

Be this as it may, the preſent Sam. reading was preferred by Durell, who renders the comma thus: "Iſſachar is the aſs of ſtrangers," or "travellers:" and thinks that this ſenſe is confirmed by the Sam. verſion תותבים, and by the next verſe, where it is ſaid that the Iſſacharites became *tributaries.* And in this he has been followed by Michaëlis, whoſe verſion is: "Iiſſachar wird "ein laſtthier der fremden." In this, I believe, they have not been followed by any later interpreter.

For my part, I ſee no good reaſon for departing from the common reading; which is well rendered in the Latin Vulg. *aſinus fortis*; by Arab. Erp. חמאר עז; and more litterally by Aquila ονος οςωδης and by Gr. Ven. ονος οςου *an aſs of bone**, i. e. *a ſtrong aſs.* So Luther: "ein beinern "eſel."—Caſtal. *aſinus oſſeus.*—Houbigant and Dathe, *aſinus robuſtus.*—Delgado, and before him Lookup and Purver, *a boney aſs.* Ainſworth, *a ſtrong-boned aſs.*

The three next words in the Text רבץ בין משפתים are in our public verſion rendered "couching down between two burdens;"—after Munſter, Caſtalio, Junius, &c.—But this is a forced meaning, which cannot well be ſqueezed out of the original. I think the Septuagint have well rendered: ανακαυομενος ανα μεσον των κληρων—and Jerom ſtill better: *inter duos terminos.* Moſt of the antient verſions have ſome ſimilar term †; and the Greek of Venice only has σηκουμενος ανα τα ημιφορτια.—The tribe of Iſſachar inhabited the fine vale of Jezreel, which was ſeparated by two natural *boundaries* or *barriers* ‡ of mountains from the tribe of Zebulon and the half-tribe of Manaſſeh, on the north and ſouth; and on the eaſt from the tribe of Gad, by the river Jordan ‖; and to this ſituation the benediction evidently alludes.—For the reſt, I have elſewhere § ſhewn that רבץ denotes not *couching under a burden* but *lying at eaſe:* as the Iſſacharites might do between their boundaries; where they cultivated a fertile ſoil, undiſturbed by their neighbours; and led not a roving life like the inhabitants of the mountains, who were often obliged to remove from place to place to find paſturage for their flocks.

Ver. 15. *And becometh a tributary ſervant.* ויהי למס עבד without any variety of reading; ſave that 5 Sam. MSS. have למוס.—The words have been variouſly underſtood. Aquila, Jerom, Syr. Saad. Arab. Erp. the Perſic tranſlator and Gr. Ven. render to the ſame purport with mine and

* The ſame metaphor we apply to a ſtrong horſe: "He is a horſe of ſome *bone*—a well-*boned* horſe, &c.

† So Luther: "zwiſchen die grentzen;"—and ſo our earlier Engliſh tranſlators; Coverdale, Matthew, and Ainſworth. Pagninus had led the way. ‡ Some moderns, among whom Michaëlis, Dathe, and Roſenmüller, think that the word which I render *barriers* ſhould be rendered *water-canals.* Durell's verſion is "between two bars," i. e. ſays he, a place where cattle are railed in and confined.—Green: "in his ſtall."—Delgado: "between two rows of ſheep."—Purver: "between two packs." All, in my opinion, erroneous. See the Rem. on Judges, 5. 16. ‖ Ισαχαρις, Καρμηλον τε ορος και τον ποταμον του μηνους ποιησαμενη τερμονα [al. τερματα], το δε Ιταβυριον ορος του πλατους. Joſeph. Antiq. l. v. c. 1. ſect. 22.—Perhaps Symmachus had theſe boundaries in view, when he rendered αγαμεσον των γειτονιων. § See the Remark on Gen. 1. 4. 7.

the

the common verſion.—But Onkelos and the Thargumiſts, unwilling to make Iſſachar *a tributary*, take the liberty to pervert the text into a quite contrary meaning; namely, *that he made tributaries of his enemies.* But indeed their whole paraphraſe of the verſe is ſo licentious, as to deſerve no notice: although partly adopted by Jarhi and other Jewiſh commentators.—We have, therefore, only to advert to the Septuagint verſion, which differs from all the reſt; and without any remarkable variety of lection runs thus: *και εγενηθη ανηρ γεωργος*; and ſo nearly Symmachus: *και εσαι γεωργος υπηρετειν.* This explanation would perfectly ſuit the character of Iſſachar, and the context: but how extract it from the Hebrew? In Syriac I find מסמא uſed for a *goad:* is it probable that the Hebrews might call a tiller of the ground *a goad-ſervant**: as we ſay a *plough-man?* In the Eaſt, the man who holds the plough, directs alſo the cattle with a ſort of goad. Theſe cattle are commonly no more than a couple of oxen, cows or aſſes; and ſometimes a ſingle ox, cow or aſs: ſo light is the plough, ſo ſhallow the furrow, and ſo eaſily pulveriſed the ſoil.—And this leads me to another etymon in favour of the Septuagint, from whom I never diſſent but with reluctance.—One meaning of מסס is *conterere, contundere*, &c. may not למס or למוס, then, ſignify to *break* the clod, as we ſay; and as the Latins, *frangere glebas, offringere terram*, &c.

At any rate, the Iſſacharites ſeem to have been a ſettled agricultural tribe; who cultivating their own territory with *patient* labour (emblematized by the aſs) were able to pay a part of the produce by way of tribute to the Chanaanite nations, whom they were not able to ſubdue: or, as I think more probable, to the other tribes who had not grain enough to ſupport their families, employed chiefly in rearing flocks and herds. We rarely read of Iſſachar being engaged in any war: which is ever hoſtile to agriculture. Their *chiefs*, indeed, ſometimes appear on the ſcene of action. They were Barak's truſty guard in his expedition againſt Siſerah†: and among thoſe who came to Hebron to make David king‡, are mentioned *chiefs* of Iſſachar; but none of their dependents and retainers, who were probably left at home to cultivate the ground.

Ver. 17. *Dan ſhall be a ſerpent*, &c. This paints well the character of the Danites; who by ſtratagem more than by open bravery avenged themſelves of their enemies, and extended their conqueſts. See the whole hiſtory of Samſon; and the expedition to Leſhem, Jud. 18.

Ver. 18. [*O Lord!* &c.] I have always thought that this verſe either belonged to the benediction of Judah, or that it was interpolated. But as I am not willing readily to admit interpolations, I have given it a place in my Verſion, where it now ſtands in the text: leaving the reader to form his own judgment of it, and to make out of it—any thing he pleaſes. Whoever ſpoke it, or wrote it, it ſeems evidently to allude to the *peaceful* ſecurity of the Iſraelites, mentioned before v. 10. and to point to the ſame period.

Ver. 19. The tribe of Gad, from their ſituation, were much expoſed to the incurſions of the Arab hordes, who often invaded their territory; but were as often repulſed. There is no difficulty in the Text here:—although it has been variouſly miſunderſtood, and rendered: as the curious reader may ſee in his Polyglott: I have only to obſerve that the excellent rendering of

* Or *goad-man*; as in Scotland they ſtill call the man who drives with a goad the plowing oxen. † Jud. 5. 15.
‡ 1 Chron. 12. 32.

the

the Septuagint is there badly tranſlated: πειρωτευειν means not *tentare*, but *prædari*: and πειρωτηριον not *tentatio*, but *prædonum turma*.—Not badly Gr. Ven. Γαδος, ςρατευμα ςρατευει αυτον· εωτος τε ςρατευσει πτερνα.

Ver. 20. As the vale of Jezreel, the portion of Iſſachar, ſeems to have abounded in corn, ſo the reſidence of Aſher abounded in oil; hence in the benediction of Moſes, Deut. 33. 24. it is ſaid of Aſher, "In oil he ſhall dip his feet." And it was probably from this rich and fertile tract of Judæa that the oil and other articles of commerce, mentioned by Ezekiel, 28. 17. were principally furniſhed to the Tyrians.

Ver. 21. This verſe as it is now pointed in the Hebrew copies gives our common verſion: "Naphthali *is* a hind let looſe; he giveth goodly words." So, moſt literally, Gr. Ven. Νεφθαλις ελαφος πεμφθεισα, ὁ διδους ῥηματα καλλους; and the Lat. Vulg. *Nephthali, cervus emiſſus, et dans eloquia pulchritudinis.* So alſo Saad. Perſ. and Arab. Erp. and ſo with a ſlight metaphor Syr. and Pſeudo-Jonathan.—Onkelos ſeems not to have known what to make of his Text: but it is plain that he found no *hind* in it. A part of his paraphraſe coincides with the Septuagint verſion, which is, Νεφθαλι ςελεχος ανειμενον, επιδιδους εν τῳ γεννηματι* καλλος; which, in general terms well expreſſes the real meaning; although badly rendered in the Latin tranſlation:—it ſhould be *caudex diffuſus*, or *luxurians*; not *virgultum reſolutum*. But Bochart's verſion is ſtill better: *Naphthali terebinthus patula, edens ramos pulchros*; which, with Houbigant, Durell, Dathe and Michaëlis, I have followed in my Verſion. The metaphor is well adapted to the reſidence of Naphthali, which was a beautiful woodland country extending to Mount Lebanon; and producing fruits of every ſort.

Ver. 22. We are now come to the benediction of Joſeph, one of the fineſt paſſages in the whole Hebrew Scripture. Nothing could be better imagined, or more beautifully expreſſed. The old man is made to dwell on his beloved ſon with a complacency highly characteriſtic: he never can ſay enough; and totally exhauſts the ſubject before he leaves it.—But, the language being poetical and figurative, it is not always eaſy to aſcertain the true meaning of every particular part; although the tenour of the whole is readily enough perceived.

The very firſt words בן פרת preſent a difficulty, and have been variouſly rendered and underſtood.—Sep. υιος ηυξημενος.—Vulg. *Filius accreſcens.*—Onk. ברי דיסגי.—Syr. ברא דתרביתא, badly rendered *filius educationis*†.—Saad. אבן מתמר.—Perſ. בשרי برومند.—Arab. Erp. בן מתמר.—Gr. Ven. υιευς αυξησεως.—Thus the antients, with whom, as to the meaning of פרת, moſt of our earlieſt modern tranſlators agree: but whether בן ſhould be taken in a literal or metaphorical ſenſe, in this they differ.—Pagninus, Piſcator, Junius and our Ainſworth conſider בן פרת as denoting a *fruitful branch:* and this interpretation was adopted by our latter tranſlators: and more recently by Le Clerc, Houbigant, Dathe and Roſenmüller. The words of the laſt I will here inſert: "בן פרת propriè *filius rami*, i. e. ſurculus. פרת enim ſcriptum eſſe videtur (ut "Clericus, et poſt eum Dathius, monet) pro פארה *ramus*, omiſſa א quieſcente; ut ſæpe." I cannot ſubſcribe to this explanation; nor ſee I any reaſon to change the Text. בן פרת is litterally the *ſon of fecundity*; but as the next member of the ſentence is evidently metaphorical, this too muſt be metaphorically underſtood. The *ſon of fecundity*, then, is *a fruitful tree:* and

* Seven MSS. add here αυτου. There is no other Var. read. of importance. † It ſhould be *filius incrementi.*

this tree is ſaid to be planted by *a well:* juſt as the good man is ſaid in Pſ. 1. to be *a tree planted by water ſtreamlets.* Whether the *palm-tree* or the *vine* be here alluded to, it is diſputed. Teller will have it to be the *palm-tree*: but, from the context, I am perſuaded, with Onkelos, that it is the *vine.* I have not, however, with Green, inſerted the word *vine* in my Verſion: but the word *ſtem,* which I take to be preferable to *bough,* or *branch.* בן פרת is not *filius rami*; but *filius fertilitatis*; or, as Teller in his German verſion renders, "ein ſohn des "garten," *filius horti.*—The *daughters* mentioned afterwards are the *branches* or *tendrils.*

There are yet two other explanations, which deſerve attention, merely from the celebrity of the authors.—Our Durell, who ſeems to have thought that there was an impropriety in aſſimilating both Naphthali and Joſeph to a tree or plant of any kind, thought he had removed that objection by taking פרת to be the feminine of פר, and rendering *the ſon of a heifer:* i. e. *a bullock.* "Joſeph is a bullock; a bullock near a fountain." The *ſon of a ewe* would have been much more appropriate: for then we ſhould have had an alluſion to Joſeph's mother רחל, which bears exactly that ſignification.—And, perhaps, it was this idea that led Michaëlis to his verſion: "Der ſohn einer fruchtbaren mutter iſt Ioſeph"—*The ſon of a fruitful mother is Joſeph.* But Rahel was far from being a fruitful mother: ſhe was many years barren; and brought but two ſons at laſt.

I will now take it for granted that the firſt part of the verſe is well rendered *a fruitful ſtem is Joſeph, a fruitful ſtem by a fountain**;—but here we are again arreſted, and muſt force our way the beſt we can.—And, firſt, we muſt note the difference between the Hebrew and the Samaritan copies: the former has בנות צעדה, the latter בני צעירי. This laſt was evidently the reading of Sep. ſince they render υἱος μου νεωτατος†. How Onk. Syr. and the Thargumiſts read, it is hard to ſay: but Vulg. Perſ. Arab. Erp. Gr. Ven. and, moſt probably, Saadias, read as the preſent Hebrew. To which is the preference due? Clearly, in my opinion, to the Hebrew. The other, although followed by Sep. is frigid, and deſtroys the beauty of the trope: for what connection is there between the preceding member and "my youngeſt [or *younger*] *ſon upon the* "*wall:*" or as Sep.‡ "my younger ſon return to me." But, in the ſuppoſition that בנות is the right reading, what does it here mean? Why, if בן in the former comma be a *ſtem* or *greater bough,* בנות muſt be the *leſs branches* or *tendrils:* and then, what more beautiful than the compariſon? Joſeph is a fruitful vine, the tendrils of which luxuriantly ſpread, and cover the whole wall againſt which it is planted‖. This evidently alludes to the very numerous poſterity of Joſeph; or, as Moſes in his Song expreſſes it, *the ten thouſands of Ephraim,* and *the thouſands of Manaſſeh.*

Although I prefer, and follow, the Hebrew reading, I am perſuaded that it has been early corrupted in one letter; and that the original reading was not צעדה but צעדו. Many *vau's* and *he's* have been interchanged in the Hebrew text from their great reſemblance in the antient characters.—I know no modern tranſlator who has preferred the Sam. lection; except Houbi-

* I take no notice of thoſe commentators who render עלי עין *ad* or *juxta oculum:* that is, ſay they, *ita pulcher, ut admiraretur oculis.* The Septuagint ζηλωτης, or the Vulgate *decorus aſpectu,* may have given riſe to this idea. Yet Jerom, in his *Hebrew Queſtions,* has *ſuper fontem.* † Compl. and 9 MSS. have νεωτερος. ‡ They read שוב *revertere,* for שור, from the great ſimilarity in the more antient Hebrew alphabet between the letters *reſh* and *beth.* ‖ Dathe: *cujus germina ſuper murum aſcendunt.*—Green: *whoſe branches ſhoot over the wall.* So alſo the Swediſh tranſlators.

gant

gant and Durell; the former of whom renders: *filius meus junior mihi imperat*—a ſtrange verſion, indeed, although great pains he has taken to defend it both in his Prolegomena and Notes*.—Durell: "My ſon, my young one was upon the wall; and the archers, &c." which how *well* he defends, the reader may ſee in p. 92. and 93. of his Diſſertation. To me it appears to deſtroy the beauty of the paſſage.

But what ſhall we ſay of Michaëlis? who thus renders the Hebrew reading: "vor dem auge "der töchter, die prächtig einhertritt, ſich ſehen zu laſſen."—I will only ſay that it is a verſion unworthy of Michaëlis.

Ver. 23. 24. 25. There is hardly any thing worthy of remarking here, ſave that Sam. has ירבדו inſtead of ירבו: and ſo Vulg. *Jurgati ſunt:* which reading I think preferable; and have, with Houbigant and Michaëlis, followed it in my Verſion.—The remaining part of this benediction is delightful, and ſurpaſſes any thing of the kind. How ample and fine a deſcription of Mount-Ephraim and Mount-Gilead, and the territories of the two tribes! every earthly bleſſing is here accumulated, that the heart of man can deſire:—dews from the heavens—ſprings from the earth—fiſh from the ſeas and lakes—a numerous offſpring, both of children and cattle—a fertile and ſalubrious ſoil—peaceful days and laſting proſperity—are all wiſhed for Joſeph, by his affectionate dying father†.

Ver. 27. I am not, now, quite pleaſed with my verſion of this verſe: and yet I know not well how to mend it.—The word עד, commonly rendered *prey*, is by Sep. rendered ετι;—το πρωϊνον εδεται ετι, και εις το ἑσπερας διδωσι‡ τροφην; and, if there were any example of עד ſignifying *continuance* of time without an *objective* caſe, I ſhould have no difficulty in admitting this tranſlation. "He ravens *on* from the day-break: and in the evening he divides the ſpoil." But I doubt if עד have ever ſuch an indefinite meaning.—Green ſuppoſes that there has been a tranſpoſition in the words, and that the firſt comma ſhould be the laſt‖: and this, in part at leaſt, ſeems to have been the reading of the Syr. tranſlator: but as all the copies, both Heb. and Sam. as well as all the other Antient verſions, read as we now read; I would not without ſome very cogent reaſon admit of any alteration in the Text: but would either give a ſomewhat different meaning to the word אכל, namely *to take*, which it ſometimes has in the Chaldee: ſo that the verſion might be "In the morning he catcheth his prey, and toward even he divideth "the ſpoil:"—or, with Teller, ſay that the word חלק ſignifies here, not *to divide*, but *to tear:* ſo that the meaning will be only a repetition of the wolf's ravening: "mane *comedet* "prædam, et veſpere *diſcerpet* ſpolium" i. e. *ſemper hoſtes ſuos infeſtabit*.—The tribe of Benjamin were certainly a warlike race. They twice routed the collected force of the other tribes with a far inferior number§. On this occaſion we are told that, beſides wielding the ſword and javelin with their right hands, many of them could uſe their left hands with great dexterity. "They could ſling ſtones at an hair and not miſs¶." The Judge *Ehud*, one of thoſe left handed worthies, diſpatched Eglon; and putting himſelf at the head of a ſudden collection

* "Videt Jacob in Joſeph filio ſuo *alterum* Joſeph, nempe MESSIAM, in quem etiam prophetiæ hujus cætera verba "collimant." Credat! † See a fine deſcription of the *Samaritis* in Joſephus de Bello Jud. l. iii. c. iii. ſect. 4. ‡ So Vat. but Compl. Ald. Alex. and 31 MSS. have διαδωσει. ‖ His verſion is "In the evening he ſhall eat the prey, and *for* the morning he ſhall *leave part of* the ſpoil:" but this is forcing upon חלק a ſenſe which, in my apprehenſion, it cannot bear § See Jud. 20. 15—25. ¶ Jud. 20. 16.

of troops, gained ſo complete a victory over the Moabites, that "the land had reſt eighty "years*."

Saul, too, although a reprobated king, was certainly a man of valour; and the warlike feats of both him and his ſon Jonathan are celebrated even by his competitor and ſucceſſor David, in moſt beautiful ſtrains†. The ſame royal poet pays a ſimilar compliment to Abner, who had for ſeveral years ſupported the houſe of Saul againſt himſelf‡; and who, if he had not been diſguſted at the conduct of Iſhboſheth, might have long continued the conteſt, with at leaſt doubtful ſucceſs. And when he came over to the ſide of David, Joab was ſo ſenſible of his ſuperior merit, that he way-laid and aſſaſſinated him.—Yet not even after this were the Benjaminites ſubdued, or relinquiſhed their attachment to the houſe of Saul. When the other tribes came in great numbers to make David king at Hebron; no more than three thouſand of the tribe of Benjamin appeared: "for as yet (ſays the hiſtorian) the greater part of them fa-"voured the houſe of Saul||:" and the poſterior rebellion againſt David was headed by Shebah Ben-Bichri, "a Benjaminite§."—In ſhort, it is clear that the tribe of Benjamin were a very warlike tribe; and as war, in thoſe days, was ever followed by depredation, they might juſtly be likened to a ravenous wolf. Perhaps the great prey taken by Saul, after the deſtruction of the Amalekites, may be particularly alluded to.

Ver. 33. *He drew up his feet*, &c. We may ſuppoſe that Jacob, while he delivered his laſt words, was ſitting upon his bed, with his legs without it, and his feet on the floor: his drawing up his feet, when he had done, was natural; and as he was now exhauſted with ſpeaking, he expired immediately after.

CHAP. L.

Ver. 19. *FOR a reverer of God am I.*—The reading of the preſent Hebrew Text is: כי התחת אלהים אני; which in our common verſion is rendered: "For *am* I in the place of God?" from Pagninus's *Nunquid enim loco Dei ſum?* But none of the more antient tranſlators ſeem to have underſtood the words in that meaning, ſave Aquila, Symmachus, and Gr. Ven.** The rendering of Sep. is without any important variation: του γαρ Θεου ειμι εγω. Vulg. *Num Dei poſſumus reſiſtere voluntati?* Syr. מטל דתחות אלהא אנא.—Onk. ארי דחלא דיי אנא.—Tharg. ארום דחיל ומתכר מן קדם יי אנא.—Saad. אני אתאף אללה.—Arab. Erp. לאן אתאף מן אללה אנא.—Perſ. תרסידנאארי חדא מן. *Timens Dei ego.* All theſe tranſlators, except the firſt three, expreſs the idea of *fear, reverence, awe*: hence ſome modern critics have thought that they had before them the Sam. reading התחת: and, indeed, this reading ſeems preferable to the preſent reading, both from the context, and from a ſimilar ſaying of Joſeph's, in another place, but on a ſimilar occaſion: namely, Ch. 42. 18. את האלהים אני ירא.—His brothers, among other motives for his forgiving them, had urged their being "the ſervants of *his* father's "God," v. 17.—*Fear not*, ſays Joſeph—*for I particularly revere that God.* All this, I think,

* Jud. 4. 30. † 2 Sam. 1. 21, 22. ‡ 2 Sam. 3. 34. || 1 Chron. 12. 29. § 2 Sam 20. 2,

** The firſt has, ὁτι μη αντι Θεου εγω; the ſecond, μη γαρ αντι Θεου ειμι εγω; and the latter, επειπερ ἀρ αντι του Θεου τελω;

is included in the word החתת, where the ה is not an *interrogative*; but a very ſignificant *relative*, indicating a more than common reverence for the Divinity: as we ſometimes ſay in Engliſh "I am *the* man who dare do ſuch and ſuch a thing."—Thus Jerem. Lam. 3. 1. אני הגבר ראה עני.—The more ſtill to expreſs his reverence, he uſes a ſtronger word than in ch. 42. חתת inſtead of ירא.—As this reading *, then, makes an excellent ſenſe, is congenial to Joſeph's piety, and agreeable to the context, I have with Houbigant, Dathe, Roſenmüller, &c. given it the preference in my Verſion: but I muſt, at the ſame time, allow that the other reading is not without its plauſibility. But, then, החתת muſt not be rendered *inſtead of*, but *under* or *ſubordinate to*. So Luther: "Denn ich bin unter Godt," and ſo our firſt tranſlators, Coverdale and Matthew: "for I am under God"—"am not I under God?" And, perhaps, the Septuagint του γαρ Θεου ειμι εγω may be reducible to the ſame meaning: as εγω μεν ειμι Παυλου in 1 Corinth. 1. 13.—Nay, I would not poſitively affirm that the other antient tranſlators, who have rendered as if החתת, not תחת, had been in their copies, might not have read the latter: although they gave the phraſe another turn. The Thargumiſt, in particular, ſeems to have had ſomething like תחת in his view, as he adds מתכר, which give the idea of *ſubjection* and *humiliation*; more than once expreſſed by תחת in the Hebrew Scriptures, particularly in the Pſalms.—Either of the readings, then, will admit my Verſion: although, on the whole, I am inclined to give the preference to the Samaritan.

Ver. 23. *In the days of Joſeph.* So Sam. בימי יוסף; which, with the Author of *Commentaries and Eſſays*, I prefer to the preſent Hebrew reading על ברכי יוסף; which James's tranſlators render *upon Joſeph's knees*: giving to ילדו the forced meaning *were brought up*.—Dathe gives the ſentence a different turn.—*Etiam filios Macheri . . . gremio ſuo excepit:* a ſtill greater, and more unaccountable licence. Yet all the antient tranſlators had the preſent Hebrew before them, from Sep. down to Gr. Ven. See the Rem. on 2 Sam. 21. 8.

EXODUS. CHAP. I.

Ver. 10. *LET us wiſely prevent their multiplying.* Sep. admirably: κατασοφισωμεθα αυτους.—The Egyptians were famous for their cunning and worldly wiſdom. Δεινοι πλεκειν τοι μηχανας Αιγυπτιοι †.

Ib. *And get out of the land.* ועלה מן הארץ. The Syr. tranſlator read in the coactive voice: *and drive us out of the land:* and, what is more remarkable, the Coptic verſion, although made from the Greek, has the ſame reading, with *our* inſtead of *the* before *land*. This *our*, ἡμων, is alſo

* To this reading it is objected, that it is not even the common Samaritan reading, it being found in only one MS. —True: but this is confeſſedly the beſt MS. that has yet been ſeen: which was purchaſed by *Pietro della Valle*, from the Samaritans of Damaſcus; and from which Morinus publiſhed the firſt printed copy of the Sam. Examplar. Beſides, we learn from the Fragments of Origen's Hexapla, that it was the reading of his day—το Σαμαρειτικον: και γαρ φοζουμενος Θεου εγω ειμι. † Fragm. Eſchyl. apud Scholiaſt. in Nub. Ariſtoph.

in

in the Glaſg. and perhaps ſome other MSS.*—In this verſe the Rev. Mr. Dimock would read תקרא המלחמה; and ſo ſeems to have read Gr. Ven. *επαν συμβαιη πολεμος.*—But all the Antients read as the preſent Text; I mean as it is in the Samaritan copy, תקראנו, not תקראנה; although our ſticklers for the integrity of the Hebrew text excuſe this blunder, by calling it a *Chaldaiſm.*

Ver. 16. *Ye ſhall inſpect the troughs.* וראיתן על האבנים; rendered in our common verſion, "and ſee *them* upon the ſtools;" from Pagninus's *videritis ſuper ſellas.* So Luther: "und auf "dem ſtuhl ſehet:" and ſo moſt modern interpreters, who have litterally rendered.—The great point is, to aſcertain the meaning of אבנים. In Heb. Chald. Syr. Sam. and Æth. the common ſignification of אבן is a *ſtone*; in which ſenſe it frequently occurs, both in its ſingular and plural forms. But in two places, here and Jerem. 18. 3. it has been ſuppoſed to have a different meaning, and has been variouſly tranſlated. In Jerem. it is by our tranſlators rendered *wheels*; and, in the margin, *frames*, or *ſeats.*—In both places the Ant. verſions vary, but more particularly in the former. Sep. renders the whole comma thus: *και ωσι προς τω τικτειν.* Vulg. *et partûs tempus advenerit:* both, ſeemingly, a paraphraſe.—Onk. and Tharg. על מתברא *ad eruptionem:* not, *ſuper ſellam,* as Tharg. is badly rendered in the Polyglott.—Syr. תויתין חזין מא דברכן *Be attentive when they* (the women in labour) *are on their knees: i. e.* in the act of bearing.—Both Arabs: אלמנבר, rendered, in Pol. *exhedra*; by Michaëlis *ſuggeſtum.* I cannot, however, think that either is the meaning; and ſuſpect that the true Arabic reading is †אלמנתר *profluvium*; and nearly equivalent to the מתברא of Onkelos.—Perſ. renders litterally סנגּדא *ſtones.*—Gr. Ven. *επι ταις καθεδραις.*—So much for the Ant. verſions.

I have already obſerved that moſt modern tranſlators are for *ſtools*, or a *ſtool* ſuppoſed to be compoſed of two pieces. Even Dathe adopts this verſion: *attenderent in ſella, num puer ſit.*—But ſome Jewiſh rabbis, with Oleaſter, Vatable and Grotius, imagine that אבנים ſignifies *the hinges of the womb* (as they are pleaſed to term them) which give way to the fœtus, at the time of birth. I ſhall give their comment in the words of Oleaſter: "*Obnaim* (אבניים) hìc puto "ſignificare duos cardines ventris, qui ſunt ad modum oſtii in ædificio; et vocantur *obnaim* "à *ben*, quod eſt filius; quod per illa oſtia, ſeu cardines, filii egrediantur. Et ſi objicias: quo- "modo poſſent obſtetrices intra cardines videre, an eſſet maſculus, an fœmina? hoc facile "cognoſci poteſt; quoniam *facies* in maſculo *infernè*, in fœmina verò *ſupernè!*" What a wonderful knowledge in anatomy and midwifery the good father here diſcovers! but he took it from Rabbi Joſeph, and D. Kimhi: whom the reader may ſee, if he chooſes, on the word אבן; or in Fagius's Commentary, in the firſt volume of the *Sacred Critics.*

Michaëlis, with great ingenuity, defends the Septuagint and Vulgate; deriving אבנים from the Arab. אבאן, אואן or אפאן, all which ſignify *time, occaſion,* &c. and renders, in his German verſion, "bey eintretender geburt darauf acht zu geben:" and this is deemed the better rendering by Schulze and Roſenmüller. Caſtalio ſeems to have had the ſame idea, as he renders *in ipſo enixu:* unleſs he had in view the מתברא of Onkelos.—Even the text of Jeremiah Michaëlis thinks ſuſceptible of the ſame meaning—*ipſum tempus quo vas perficitur et finitur.* In

* I am ſorry that Dr. Holmes's Collation has been publiſhed only as far as the end of Geneſis: ſo that I cannot avail myſelf of it any further, except in a very few inſtances; and that with reſpect to three MSS. only. † The ת and ב in Arabic are diſtinguiſhed only by diacritic points; and are often, in MSS. confounded with one another.

this,

this, I believe, few critics will agree with him: and, I confeſs, I cannot agree with him, with reſpect to the meaning of the word, here. For, in the firſt place, it is not probable that the Hebrew writer would make uſe of an uncommon Arabic word to expreſs the *tempus pariendi:* when his own language afforded him a much better, namely עת לדת, which is the very term uſed by Job. 39. 1. and 2; and by Solomon, Eccl. 3. 2. עת ללדת.—Secondly, if the writer had uſed אבן in the meaning of the Arab. אבאן, he would not probably have uſed it in the plural number.—Thirdly, the verb ראה conſtructed with על, which, by the by, it rarely is*, denotes *ſuperinſpection*, or *attention to* ſome *perſon* or *thing*, but never, I believe, *to time* or *place*. All theſe conſiderations make me reject Michaëlis's verſion. As to the Septuagint and Jerom; they ſeem, to me, to have gueſſed at the meaning from the context: without knowing what to make of אבנים.

But what, then, are we to make of it? Why; as אבנים certainly ſignifies *ſtones*; and as in the ſame book of Exodus, 7. 19. it denotes *ſtone ciſterns*; why may it not here denote *ſtone troughs*; in which, according to the Eaſtern cuſtom, new-born infants are waſhed? This ſenſe accords perfectly well with the paſſage of Jeremiah; which Blayney and Bradley, after Sep. render *upon the ſtones*; but which I would render, as here, *troughs*; in which the potter wrought his materials into a proper conſiſtency.—Whether thoſe troughs were compoſed of ſeveral ſtones, as the plural form אבנים ſhould ſeem to infer, cemented together, as many of our ciſterns are; or were hollowed ſingle ſtones, it is impoſſible to determine; although I am inclined to think that the firſt ſtone troughs were made of ſeveral pieces: and might be *bathing-places*, as well as *ciſterns*; for the purpoſe of ablution.—This is the beſt interpretation I can make of the paſſage: in which I was preceded by Bate. But I would not, with him and Parkhurſt, tranſlate "when ye ſee them on the ſtone troughs;" becauſe there is no *them* in the original; and becauſe I am perſuaded that the *inſpection* regarded the *infant*, not the *mother*.

Ver. 19. *They are more vigorous.* כי חיות הנה; which the antients render variouſly Sep. τικτουσι.—Sym. μαιαι γαρ εισι; from whom Jerom. *obſtetricandi habent ſcientiam.*—Theod. ὁτι ζωογονουσιν.—Onk. ארי חכימן אנין *For wiſe*† *are they*; and to the ſame purpoſe paraphraſes the Bab. Tharg. but Jeruſ. has חיין *vivacious*. Syr. חיתא, the ſame word by which *mid-wives* are denoted in the preceding comma.—Saad. בצירא *intelligent.*—Arab. Erp. עארפאת of the ſame import.—Perſ. הנرمנדאן *ingenious.*—Gr. Ven. θημα —This laſt meaning has been adopted by ſome moderns: who make the mid-wives tell Pharaoh, that the Hebrew women are like *brute beaſts*, who have no need of obſtetric aid. Michaëlis is for *mid-wives*, and thinks that all thoſe verſions which render by words that denote *intelligence*, *wiſdom*, *ſkill*, are metaphorical expreſſions; like the French *ſages femmes*, &c. But it is well obſerved by Dathe, if the author had meant to ſay that the Hebrew women were *mid-wives*, he would not probably have changed the terms; and ſubſtituted חיות for מילדות.—Beſides, if the Hebrew women were themſelves mid-wives; what need was there for other mid-wives at all?—On the whole, then, I am perſuaded that חיות is here to be taken in its litteral meaning; and denotes the *lively vigour* of the Hebrew women to bear children with little or no aſſiſtance. "Je ne ſçais pas (ſays De la "Roque) ſi les femmes Arabes ſentent moins de mal que les autres; ou ſi elles le ſupportent

* Not, I believe, above five or ſix times; and only twice in the Pentateuch. † Or *ſkilful.*

"plus

" plus courageuſement: mais elles accouchent en chemin, et partout où elles ſe trouvent. " Quelques momens après qu'elles ſont delivrées, elles prennent l'enfant, lui lient le nombril, " et le vont laver à la prémière fontaine.—"The women at Aleppo (ſays Ruſſel, vol. 1. p. 299.) " have eaſier labours, than in the northern regions: owing, perhaps, to the frequent uſe of " the bath, as well as to the mild climate: for, in the latter months of pregnancy, they go " very often to the bagnio."

Ver. 21. *He proſpered their own families.* יעש להם בתים, lit. *he made to them houſes.* The word להם being in the maſculine gender, our grammarians will have it to be an *enallage.* As I am always unwilling to admit ſuch *enallages*, I hoped to find לה in the Sam. exemplar, and perhaps in ſome Hebr. MSS. But no! all uniformly read להם. What then are we to do? admit the *enallage?* or refer להם not to the mid wives, but to the Iſraelites? The latter has pleaſed Michaëlis and Dathe: but pleaſes not me. The context, I think, evidently tells us to apply it to the mid-wives: *becauſe they feared God, God rewarded them,* is a clear conſiſtent ſentence: whereas, *becauſe they feared God, God rewarded the Iſraelites*; is unnatural and unconſecutive.—All the Greek tranſlators, even Gr. Ven. underſtood it to be the mid-wives; whether they read להם or לה. Sep. εποιησεν* ἑαυταις οικιας.—Aquila εποιησεν ἑαυταις οικους.—Sym. εποιησεν† ἑαυταις οικιας.—Theod. εποιησεν αυταις‡ οικους.—Gr. Ven. εποιησεν ουν εκειναιν δομος —an error, for δομους.—Of the other ant. verſions, ſome are ambiguous as the Vulg. and Perſ. —The Thargumiſts and both Arabs have the maſculine להון, להמא, להם: but Syr. has להנין. —Whether, then, we admit the *enallage*, or ſuppoſe that the original reading was לה; we muſt, I think, refer it to the mid-wives. The meaning is well explained by a Greek ſcholiaſt in Caten. Nicet. τοιουτον εϛι το, εποιησεν αυταις οικους, τουτ' εϛιν ηυξησεν αυταις το γενος.

Ver. 22. *Then Pharaoh charged all his people,* &c. The cauſe of this cruel order, according to Joſephus, was the prediction of an Egyptian Seer, that a Hebrew child was about to be born, who would one day diminiſh the power of Egypt, and increaſe that of the Iſraelites: των ἱερογραμματεων τις . . . αγγελλει τῳ βασιλει, " τεχθησεσθαι τινα, κατ' εκεινον τον καιρον, τοις Ισραηλιταις, ὁς " ταπεινωσει μεν την των Αιγυπτιων ἡγεμονιαν, αυξησει δε τους Ισραηλιτας τροφεις· αρετῃ δε παντας ὑπερβαλει, " και δοξαν αειμνηϛον κτησεται." Antiq. lib. ii. c. 9. n. 2.—The ſame hiſtorian tells us, ib. n. 3. that God revealed all this more explicitly to Amram in a dream: which, on awaking, he told to his wife Jochabel, or Jochabed. Hence their great care and anxiety about the ſafety of their child.—But of all this not a ſingle word in the book of Exodus.

CHAP. II.

Ver. 3. *AN ark of papyrus.* תיבת גמא. Forſter makes the latter word a compound of θαι *a ſhip* and βαι *a palm-branch.* But why introduce here an Egyptian compound? Had it been a proper name ſuch as *Moſes* or *Zaphnath-paaneah,* there might be ſome reaſon for ſeeking Egyptian etymologies: but this is an appellative noun; and the ſame word that is uſed to expreſs the *ark* of Noah.—I imagine the radical meaning may be found in the Arab. תאב *conſtruere.*—

* This is the reading of Compl. which I truſt will be confirmed by ſome of Holmes's MSS. The other editions have εποιησαν. † Such is the genuine reading; not εποιησαν, as in Montfaucon. See Scharfenberg, p. 53.
‡ Better than ἑαυταις.

Againſt

Againſt Forſter's derivation is the meaning of גמא, which is evidently a Hebrew word, that expreſſes well the *bibulous* nature of the *papyrus*, but not of the *palm-tree*—

Conſeritur bibulâ Memphitis cymba papyro*.

It is remarkable that Lucan here uſes a word nearly equivalent to the Arabic ראב *conſtruere*. —The *papyrus* is a very thirſty plant, that grows in marſhy ground on the banks of rivers. A conſiderable part of it is under water; and it grows to the height of nine or ten feet.—The pith or marrow of the ſtalk was uſed for food, the ligneous parts were conſtructed into arks and ſmall ſhips, and the bark was made into *paper*†.

Ib. *Among the ſedges*, בסוף. Sep. εις το ἑλος.—Vulg. *in carecto*. Onk. ביערא.—Syr. ברקקא. —Tharg. Bab. בגומיא.—Jeruſ. באפרא.—Saad. פי אלדים.—Arab. Erp. פי אלברדי.—Perſ. דר ניראז. —Gr. Ven. εν τῳ φυκει. All which are generic names; except the גומיא of the Bab. Thargum; which is equivalent to the Hebrew word.—There is little doubt of its being the ſedge called *ſari*; which, as we learn from Theophraſtus and Pliny, grows on the marſhy banks of the Nile, and riſes to the height of almoſt two cubits: "Fruticoſi generis eſt SARI, circum Nilum naſcens, "duorum fere cubitorum altitudine." Plin. lib. xiii. 23.

Ver. 5. *Her hand-maid.* את אמתה. The Ant. verſions differ in rendering this. Sep. την αδελφην.—Vulg. *unam e famulabus*.—Syr. לאמהתה.—Onk. ית אמתה.—Tharg. גרמידא.—Saad. ידהא.—Erp. דראעדא.—The firſt four‡ are for *hand-maid*; to which muſt be added Gr. Ven. την ἑαυτης οικετην: the reſt are for *hand* or *arm*: and ſome Jewiſh Rabbis, according to the teſtimony of Raſhi, ſo explained it. But Raſhi himſelf, as well as Aben-Ezrah, reject that explanation; which has been followed by no Chriſtian interpreter, as far as I recollect.

Ver. 10. I have made a ſtrange miſtake in my Explanatory Note on this verſe: in ſaying that Moſes was 40 years old, when his mother brought him to Pharaoh's daughter. It muſt, I think, have been immediately after the ſuckling time: which, Joſephus ſays, was three years: τριετει μεν αυτου γεγενομενου: and this, indeed, ſeems to have been the common period of ſuckling. Comp. 2 Machab. 7. 27.

Ib. *And called his name Moſes.* ותקרא שמו משה. That the daughter of Pharaoh would give her adopted ſon an Egyptian name, is hardly to be doubted: but that משה is an Egyptian word, I cannot eaſily believe. Philo indeed, who was an Alexandrian Helleniſt-Jew, ſays it is derived from μως which is the Egyptian name for water. Joſephus chants the ſame ſong to a ſomewhat different tune: το γαρ ὑδωρ ΜΩ οἱ Αιγυπτιοι καλουσιν, ΥΣΗΣ δε τους εξ ὑδατος σωθεντας. Clemens Alex. contents himſelf with μωϋ. Gregory of Nyſſa ſays the whole word Μωϋσης ſignifies *water*: Μωϋσης γαρ το ὑδωρ λεγεται τῃ των Αιγυπτιων φωνῃ.—Suidas, with Clem. Alex. only ſays that Μωϋσης is derived from μοϋ. Μοϋ το ὑδωρ παρ' Αιγυπτιοις· εξ ὁυ και Μωϋσης.—The Septuagint tranſlators ſeem to have been of the ſame opinion: as they write the name Μωϋσης *Moyſes*.—Notwithſtanding all this, I have no heſitation in affirming, with Vereſtoi‖, that the word משה is Hebrew, not Egyptian: and that the paronomaſy is borrowed not from *water*, but

* Lucan, iv. 136. † See Suidas in verbo Παπυρος.—Plin. lib. xiii. 11. Theophraſt. lib. iv. 9. and Celſius Hierobot, P. ii. p. 137, &c. ‡ The ית אמתה of Onkelos is, in the Latin tranſlation, unwarrantably rendered *brachium*. ‖ In *Sylloge Diſſertationum*, &c. vol. i. p. 8. et ſeq.

from *extraction* out of the water. "She called his name Moſes *(extraction)* becauſe (ſaid ſhe) "I *extracted* him out of the water!"—It is not, however, improbable, that the Hebrew hiſtorian gave the equivalent of ſome Egyptian word, for the purpoſe of playing on it: as is very common in Hebrew proper names. Aben-Ezrah ſays that the Egyptian name of *Moſes* was *Monios*, or *Munios*; as he found in an Egyptian book on agriculture, tranſlated into Arabic, entitled עבדות האדמה *The culture of the land.*—But enough of the name of *Moſes*: let us proceed to his hiſtory *.

Ver. 11. *In thoſe days.* בימים ההם. It is hardly neceſſary to tell the Scripturiſt, that theſe words denote any period of time, never very remote, but not always very near, to prior occurrences. The protomartyr Stephen (Acts, 7. 23.) ſays this happened in the 40th year of Moſes's age—on which I find the following juſt remark of Archbiſhop Secker: "Whence did he learn "that? He (Moſes) muſt have been more than *forty* when he left Egypt, or muſt have ſtaid "*forty* years with Jethro"—which is not at all probable. There might have been, however, a tradition among the Jews in Stephen's time, that Moſes had left Egypt in his fortieth year; although this be no where recorded in Scripture. But that tradition is of no great weight in ſettling Scripture chronology.—During this firſt period of the life of Moſes, whatever was its duration, Joſephus† makes him carry on a ſucceſsful war againſt the Æthiopians, after the Egyptians had been ſhameſully routed by them. For, after that defeat, having conſulted the Divinity, they were told that they muſt call into their aid a *Hebrew!*—Then who ſo proper as *Moſes*, the adopted ſon of *Thermuthis*? for that was the name of Pharaoh's daughter.—Well; Moſes is charged with an expedition againſt the Æthiopians—and uſes the following ſtratagem to ſurpriſe them: Inſtead of marching along the banks of the Nile, he traverſes a deſert; and as this deſert is infeſted with a prodigious number of ſerpents of the moſt dangerous kind, he takes along with him coops of *ibiſes*, the mortal enemies of the ſerpentine race; and, in proper time and place, lets them looſe upon the ſerpents; whom they ſuddenly devour, and clear the way for the Egyptian army.—The Æthiopians are ſurpriſed, beaten, and ſhut up in their capital *Saba* (afterwards *Meroë*), a ſtrong inſulated place, and extremely difficult to reduce.—But while Moſes is performing prodigies of valour, during the ſiege, *Tharbis*, the Æthiopian king's daughter, falls deſperately in love with him, and offers to deliver up the town, on condition that he marry her.—No ſooner ſaid, than done: φθανει το εργον τους λογους—and, after the deſtruction of the Ethiopians, κατα την αναιρεσιν των Αιθιοπων, and thanks given to God, ευχαριςησας τω Θεω, Moſes conſummates the marriage, συντελει τον γαμον; and marches back the victorious Egyptians into their own country.—And this is the ſame Joſephus, who ſeriouſly tells us, that he writes nothing, in his Jewiſh Antiquities, which he draws not from the *ſacred* books of his nation! Either, then, the *ſacred* books of his nation were different from the *ſacred*

* We have here another curious anecdote in Joſephus.—When Thermuthis preſented her adopted ſon to her father, as his apparent ſucceſſor to the throne of Egypt, the King took him in his arms, and put his own diadem upon the boy's head. But the petulant boy threw it on the ground, and trampled upon it. On which, the ſame ſeer who had foretold the birth of Moſes, exclaimed, "This is that very child, O King! whom if we kill, God has declared us ſafe "and ſecure... By deſtroying him, then, free the Egyptians from their apprehenſions, and cut off all hopes from the "Iſraelites."—The interpoſition of Thermuthis, however, prevailed, and Moſes was ſaved. Ant. lib. ii. c. 9. n. 7.
† Antiq. lib. vii. c. 10.

books

books of our preſent Hebrew Bible; or Joſephus made no ſcruple of interlarding them with apocryphal ſtories. Of what value, then, is his teſtimony, "That the Jews had ſo great a "veneration for their *ſacred* Scriptures, that, after the lapſe of many ages, no one had dared "to add any thing to them, ſubtract any thing from them, or make any alteration in them?" Δηλον δ'εξω εργῳ, πως ἡμεις τοις ἰδιοις γραμμασι πεπιστευκαμεν τοσουτου γαρ αιωνος ηδη παρῳχηκοτος, ουτε προσθειναι τις ουδεν, ουτε αφελειν εαυτων, ουτε μεταθειναι τετολμηκεν. Contra Apion. lib. i. ſect. 8. vol. 2. p. 441, 442. ed. Havercamp.

I have contraſted this teſtimony with the foregoing abſtract, not to depreciate the merit of Joſephus as an hiſtorian: for I admire him in that capacity; and deem his ſtory of the Æthiopic war at leaſt as credible as many parts of the Moſaical hiſtory in the Pentateuch—but to ſhew, how inconſiſtent he is with himſelf, when the honour and veracity of his nation are called in queſtion.—For if Apion had retorted, and ſaid: "Ye Jews pretend to be ſo exceedingly ſcrupulous about adding, paring, or altering any thing in what ye call your *ſacred* "*writings*, that no one (you ſay) ever dared to do ſuch a nefarious deed; let me aſk you, in "which of thoſe *ſacred* records have you found the ſtory of the Æthiopic war?" I believe Joſephus, with all his ingenuity, would have been puzzled to give a tolerable anſwer.

Ver. 12. *Hid him in the ſand.* That, in caſe his body ſhould be diſcovered, it might be believed that he had been accidentally overwhelmed; as it frequently happens in ſandy regions. See Le Clerc on the place.

Ver. 13. *Quarrelling.* נצים. It denotes *pulling one another by the hair:* as women are wont to do. Sep. διαπληκτιζομενους.—Vulg. *rixantes.*—Aquila and Sym. διαμαχομενους.—Gr. Ven. εντοχλουμενω, in the dual number.

Ver. 16. *A prieſt of Midian.* Or, *a prince of Midian*; for the word כהן ſignifies both: and perhaps both were united in the perſon of Raguel; like Virgil's Anius, who was at the ſame time king of Delos and prieſt of Apollo:

"Rex Anius; rex idem hominum, Phœbique ſacerdos."

So the Rabbis ſay, that כהן denotes either ראש העם or עובד אלהים *the head of the people* or *the miniſter of God:* and indeed I take the former to have been the original meaning of the word. Every one knows that *Chan* חאן is the title of the *ſovereign* of Tartary: and even in Hebrew the word כהן muſt ſometimes be underſtood of *political*, not *ſacerdotal*, preëminence. The ſons of David, 2 Sam. 8. 18. are called כהנים, although they were not prieſts.

Ib. *Their father Jethro.* In my Explan. Note, I have ſaid that Jethro was the ſame with Hobab, who accompanied Moſes through the wilderneſs, and whoſe poſterity, under the name of Kenites, ſettled in the wilderneſs of Judah. Jud. 1. 16. By comparing all the paſſages that relate to thoſe relations of Moſes, I am now of opinion that Hobab was a younger brother of Jethro: as it is not probable that Jethro, the elder ſon, would abandon his father and the prieſthood, or principality, in Midian; to which his birthright entitled him.

Ver. 22. *Again ſhe bare,* &c. This addition is not in the preſent copies of either Sam. or Hebr. but I have no doubt of its having been once a part of the Text. It is in the Latin Vulgate, and in the Syriac and Arabic verſions in the Polyglott: and in moſt copies of Sep. namely, in the Complutenſian and Aldine editions; in the Coptic verſion, in the Glaſgow Octa-

teuch, in the uncial Ambroſian MS. and in that of Abbate Canonico: and I doubt not but it will be found in ſeveral other MSS. when Dr. Holmes's Collation ſhall appear,

Ver. 23. *After many days.* Stephen (Acts, 7. 30.) ſays it was after forty years. But ſee the Rem. on ver. 11. and on Ch. 7. 7.

Ver. 25. *Manifeſted himſelf to them.* The preſent Text has וידע אלהים, *and God knew.* In which, ſay our critics, there ſeems to be a ſort of emphaſis, by which it is hinted that God would no longer delay his aid. "In hac repetitione aliqua *εμφασις* ineſſe videtur, qua innuitur, "Deum noluiſſe diutius differre auxilium*." I ſhould like to ſee ſuch another *emphatical repetition* in the Hebrew Scriptures. The inſtance brought by Le Clerc from ch. 1. 7. is nothing to the purpoſe, as Houbigant has well ſhewn.—Read with Sep. וידע אלהים, *και εγνωσθη*† *αυτοις.* The Complut. edition of Vulg. and moſt other editions prior to that period, have *liberavit eos*; and ſo it was printed in the edition of Sixtus V. But the Clementine correctors changed it into *cognovit eos;* which was the reading of 10 of Hentennius's MSS. and of the antient edition of Nuremberg of 1475. Both readings confirm the Hebrew reading אלהים: and *cognovit* muſt here be taken in the ſenſe of *attending to, regarding*, &c. Saadias and even Onkelos ſeem to have underſtood the Hebrew words in the ſame manner: but the Greek is by far the beſt tranſlation. A conſtruction exactly ſimilar occurs in Ezech. 20. 9. נודעתי אליהם *I manifeſted myſelf to them.*

CHAP. III.

Ver. 2. *AN angel of the Lord.* מלאך יהוה. All the Ant. verſions have either *an angel of the Lord*, or *an angel of God;* ſave Vulg. which has *Dominus* in all the copies that I have ſeen, whether edited or in MS.; and ſo the ſame angel is called ver. 4. This diſtinction of names has been conſidered by Chriſtian controverſialiſts as a proof of at leaſt a *duality* of perſons in the Godhead. He, ſay they, who is here called *the angel of Jehovah* is after called *Jehovah* himſelf. He is, therefore, at the ſame time the angel or meſſenger of God the Father, and himſelf God the Son, equal to God the Father; ſince he is called by the ſame name. Such a mode of argumentation could not, I think, be uſed by any one, well acquainted with the oriental idioms. God is ſaid to ſpeak, act, command, threaten, when any meſſenger, whether angel or prophet, ſpeaks and acts in his name.

I ſhall have another occaſion to examine in what light we are to conſider the very frequent appearances of God and his angels, mentioned in the Bible: at preſent I ſhall only ſay that, in my apprehenſion, there might, in this particular apparition, be no other angel or meſſenger, than an uncommon luminous appearance in a buſh of briars; which attracted the attention of Moſes, and might be conſidered by him as a divine call to return to Egypt for the purpoſe of delivering his brethren from their iron bondage. The Pſalmiſt (Pſ. 104. 4.) ſays "The Lord "maketh the winds his meſſengers, and flames of fire his miniſters:" and it is well known that the Chaldeans and other nations of antiquity imagined that the gods and other ſuperior beings revealed themſelves to mankind under the appearance of *fire:* and "ſo ſubtile and dazzling,"

* So Le Clerc, Dathe, Schulze, Roſenmüller, &c. † Compl. *επεγνωσθη.*

ſays

ſays Iamblichus "is the light which the gods ſhed on ſuch occaſions, that no corporeal eye "can bear it*!"—the very property here aſcribed to the light that appeared to Moſes.—But can it be believed, that the whole dialogue, contained in this and the following chapters, is founded upon the ſingle phenomenon of a fiery meteor or luminous appearance in a buſh of briars? What may appear credible or incredible to others, I know not: but I know, that I can believe this, ſooner than believe that God and Moſes verbally converſed together in the manner here related, on the bare authority of a Jewiſh hiſtorian, who lived no one can well tell when or where: and who ſeems to have been as fond of the marvellous as any Jew of any age. But let every one judge for himſelf, as he has an undoubted right to do; and believe as much, or as little, as pleaſeth him.—My belief is my own—I dictate no other man's.

Ib. *From amidſt the briars.* מתוך סנה. Sep. *εκ του βατου.* It is the ſame with the Arabic סני; and from its frequency about *Horeb* and *Sinai*, this laſt mountain is ſuppoſed to have taken its name. The very buſh from which God ſpoke, is ſtill ſhewn by the Greek Monks of Saint Baſil, who dwell there, and who call it *του ἁγιου βατου, The holy briar-buſh!* Horeb is one of the two ſummits of Sinai.—Joſephus ſays, that it is the higheſt mountain of the whole region; that it abounded in excellent paſtures, but that theſe had hitherto been untaſted, from the popular idea that *the Divinity dwelled there*; on which account the ſhepherds were afraid to approach it †. Moſes, it ſeems, was leſs ſcrupulous and more daring.

Ver. 3. *Let me turn aſide*, &c. From theſe words, ſays Roſenmüller, it is clear, that Moſes was not then dreaming, but fully *compos mentis*: "Ex his verbis apparet, Moſen non ſomniaſſe, "ſed mentis ſuæ planè compotem fuiſſe."—He ſeems to have forgotten what he had ſaid on Jacob's viſion, Gen. 32. 30. For all that is here related might juſt as well have happened in a dream, as what is there related concerning Jacob's *wreſtling*, *halting*, &c.

Ver. 5. *Put off thy ſhoes.* It is ſtill, in the Eaſt, conſidered as a mark of the higheſt reſpect, to pull off one's ſhoes, and approach bare-footed to pay adorations. The Egyptians were ſingularly attentive to this practice: and the Mohamedans ſtill take off their ſhoes before they enter their moſques. A ſimilar practice is uſed by the Roman Catholics, at the adoration of the croſs on Good Friday: although not obſerved in this country.—When any one pays his reſpects to the king of Achem in the iſle of Sumatra, he firſt takes off his ſhoes and ſtockings, and leaves them at the door.—When Mr. Wilkins wiſhed to enter the inner hall of the college of the *Seeks* at Patna, he was told it was a place of worſhip, open to him and to all men; but at the ſame time intimated "that he muſt take off his ſhoes." Aſiat. Reſearches, vol. 1. p. 289.

Ver. 8. *Into a land flowing with milk and honey.* That is, abounding in all good things. See Bochart's Hieroz. l. iv. c. 12, where may be ſeen various examples of the ſame ſort of pro-

* Και μη την γε λεπτοτητα του φωτος οἱ μεν θεοι τοσαυτην ελαμπουσιν, ὡς μη δυνασθαι χωρειν αυτην τους σωματικους οφθαλμους. *De Myſt.* ſect. 2. c. 8. The Hindoos ſay that their ſupreme God Brahmà manifeſts himſelf in a variety of ways. "When he acts immediately, without aſſuming a ſhape, or ſending forth a new emanation, as when a divine "*ſound* is heard from the ſky, that manifeſtation is called *acáſavárì*, *an ethereal voice*: when the voice proceeds from a "*meteor*, or *flame*, it is ſaid to be *agnirúpì*, or *formed of fire*." Aſiat. Reſearches, vol. iii. p. 145, 146. † See Antiq. l. ii. c. 12. n. 1.

verbial

teuch, in the uncial Ambrosian MS. and in that of Abbate Canonico: and I doubt not but it will be found in several other MSS. when Dr. Holmes's Collation shall appear.

Ver. 23. *After many days.* Stephen (Acts, 7. 30.) says it was after forty years. But see the Rem. on ver. 11. and on Ch. 7. 7.

Ver. 25. *Manifested himself to them.* The present Text has וידע אלהים, *and God knew.* In which, say our critics, there seems to be a sort of emphasis, by which it is hinted that God would no longer delay his aid. "In hac repetitione aliqua *εμφασις* inesse videtur, qua innuitur, "Deum noluisse diutius differre auxilium*." I should like to see such another *emphatical repetition* in the Hebrew Scriptures. The instance brought by Le Clerc from ch. 1. 7. is nothing to the purpose, as Houbigant has well shewn.—Read with Sep. ויודע אלהים, *και εγνωσθη† αυτοις.* The Complut. edition of Vulg. and most other editions prior to that period, have *liberavit eos*; and so it was printed in the edition of Sixtus V. But the Clementine correctors changed it into *cognovit eos;* which was the reading of 10 of Hentennius's MSS. and of the antient edition of Nuremberg of 1475. Both readings confirm the Hebrew reading אלהים: and *cognovit* must here be taken in the sense of *attending to, regarding,* &c. Saadias and even Onkelos seem to have understood the Hebrew words in the same manner: but the Greek is by far the best translation. A construction exactly similar occurs in Ezech. 20. 9. נודעתי אליהם *I manifested myself to them.*

CHAP. III.

Ver. 2. *AN angel of the Lord.* מלאך יהוה. All the Ant. versions have either *an angel of the Lord,* or *an angel of God;* save Vulg. which has *Dominus* in all the copies that I have seen, whether edited or in MS.; and so the same angel is called ver. 4. This distinction of names has been considered by Christian controversialists as a proof of at least a *duality* of persons in the Godhead. He, say they, who is here called *the angel of Jehovah* is after called *Jehovah* himself. He is, therefore, at the same time the angel or messenger of God the Father, and himself God the Son, equal to God the Father; since he is called by the same name. Such a mode of argumentation could not, I think, be used by any one, well acquainted with the oriental idioms. God is said to speak, act, command, threaten, when any messenger, whether angel or prophet, speaks and acts in his name.

I shall have another occasion to examine in what light we are to consider the very frequent appearances of God and his angels, mentioned in the Bible: at present I shall only say that, in my apprehension, there might, in this particular apparition, be no other angel or messenger, than an uncommon luminous appearance in a bush of briars; which attracted the attention of Moses, and might be considered by him as a divine call to return to Egypt for the purpose of delivering his brethren from their iron bondage. The Psalmist (Ps. 104. 4.) says "The Lord "maketh the winds his messengers, and flames of fire his ministers:" and it is well known that the Chaldeans and other nations of antiquity imagined that the gods and other superior beings revealed themselves to mankind under the appearance of *fire:* and "so subtile and dazzling,"

* So Le Clerc, Dathe, Schulze, Rosenmüller, &c. † Compl. *επεγνωσθη.*

says

ſays Iamblichus "is the light which the gods ſhed on ſuch occaſions, that no corporeal eye "can bear it*!"—the very property here aſcribed to the light that appeared to Moſes.—But can it be believed, that the whole dialogue, contained in this and the following chapters, is founded upon the ſingle phenomenon of a fiery meteor or luminous appearance in a buſh of briars? What may appear credible or incredible to others, I know not: but I know, that I can believe this, ſooner than believe that God and Moſes verbally converſed together in the manner here related, on the bare authority of a Jewiſh hiſtorian, who lived no one can well tell when or where: and who ſeems to have been as fond of the marvellous as any Jew of any age. But let every one judge for himſelf, as he has an undoubted right to do; and believe as much, or as little, as pleaſeth him.—My belief is my own—I dictate no other man's.

Ib. *From amidſt the briars.* מתוך סנה. Sep. *εκ του βατου.* It is the ſame with the Arabic סני; and from its frequency about *Horeb* and *Sinai*, this laſt mountain is ſuppoſed to have taken its name. The very buſh from which God ſpoke, is ſtill ſhewn by the Greek Monks of Saint Baſil, who dwell there, and who call it *τον αγιον βατον, The holy briar-buſh!* Horeb is one of the two ſummits of Sinai.—Joſephus ſays, that it is the higheſt mountain of the whole region; that it abounded in excellent paſtures, but that theſe had hitherto been untaſted, from the popular idea that *the Divinity dwelled there*; on which account the ſhepherds were afraid to approach it †. Moſes, it ſeems, was leſs ſcrupulous and more daring.

Ver. 3. *Let me turn aſide*, &c. From theſe words, ſays Roſenmüller, it is clear, that Moſes was not then dreaming, but fully *compos mentis:* "Ex his verbis apparet, Moſen non ſomniaſſe, "ſed mentis ſuæ planè compotem fuiſſe."—He ſeems to have forgotten what he had ſaid on Jacob's viſion, Gen. 32. 30. For all that is here related might juſt as well have happened in a dream, as what is there related concerning Jacob's *wreſtling*, *halting*, &c.

Ver. 5. *Put off thy ſhoes.* It is ſtill, in the Eaſt, conſidered as a mark of the higheſt reſpect, to pull off one's ſhoes, and approach bare-footed to pay adorations. The Egyptians were ſingularly attentive to this practice: and the Mohamedans ſtill take off their ſhoes before they enter their moſques. A ſimilar practice is uſed by the Roman Catholics, at the adoration of the croſs on Good Friday: although not obſerved in this country.—When any one pays his reſpects to the king of Achem in the iſle of Sumatra, he firſt takes off his ſhoes and ſtockings, and leaves them at the door.—When Mr. Wilkins wiſhed to enter the inner hall of the college of the *Seeks* at Patna, he was told it was a place of worſhip, open to him and to all men; but at the ſame time intimated "that he muſt take off his ſhoes." Aſiat. Reſearches, vol. 1. p. 289.

Ver. 8. *Into a land flowing with milk and honey.* That is, abounding in all good things. See Bochart's Hieroz. l. iv. c. 12, where may be ſeen various examples of the ſame ſort of pro-

* Και μη την γε λεπτοτητα του φωτος οι μεν θεοι τοσαυτην ελαμπουσιν, ως μη δυνασθαι χωρειν αυτην τους σωματικους οφθαλμους. *De Myſt.* ſect. 2. c. 8. The Hindoos ſay that their ſupreme God Brahmà manifeſts himſelf in a variety of ways. "When he acts immediately, without aſſuming a ſhape, or ſending forth a new emanation, as when a divine "*ſound* is heard from the ſky, that manifeſtation is called *acáſavárì*, *an ethereal voice:* when the voice proceeds from a "*meteor*, or *flame*, it is ſaid to be *agnirúpì*, or *formed of fire*." Aſiat. Reſearches, vol. iii. p. 145, 146. † See Antiq. l. ii. c. 12. n. 1.

verbial

verbial expreſſion in the Greek and Latin poets. Every ſchool-boy has admired the beautiful lines of Ovid:

Flumina jam lactis, jam flumina nectaris ibant;
Flavaque de viridi ſtillabant ilice mella.

On the natural fertility of Paleſtine, ſee Reland lib. i. c. 57. and an excellent Tract, already quoted, by Warnekros, in the 15th vol. of Eichhorn's *Biblical Repertory*.

Ver. 14. *I will be what I will be.* אהיה אשר אהיה. Theſe three words are variouſly rendered in the Ant. verſions.—Sep. Εγω ειμι ὁ ων, *I am the Being*.—Aq. and Theod. εσομαι, εσομαι.—Vulg. *Sum qui ſum*. Onk. Syr. and Perſ. retain the Hebrew words: and ſo, in a paraphraſtic manner, the Thargums.—Saad. אלאזלי אלדי לא יזול, *The Eternal who ceaſeth not*. To the ſame purport, although not exactly in the ſame words, Arab. Erp.—More litterally Gr. Ven. εσομαι ὁς εσομαι: which is the very verſion of Pagninus, Caſtalio, Oleaſter, Le Clerc, Dathe and others*; and which, with Luther and our firſt Engliſh tranſlators, I have adopted in my Verſion. In Cranmer's Bible it was changed into "I am that I am;" which the Genevans and James's tranſlators retained: for what reaſon it is hard to ſay. For I believe no other verſion agrees with them. Perhaps they had in view the *Sum qui ſum* of the Vulgate: but then they badly rendered†. —Much better Purver: "I am he who am:" and, long before him, Diodati: "Sono colui "che ſono;" and the French Genevan: "Je ſuis qui ſuis." To the ſame purpoſe Le Gros: "Je ſuis celui qui eſt"—all litteral verſions of the Vulg. *Sum qui ſum*; and equivalent to the Greek of Sep. Εγω ειμι ὁ ων: the meaning of which might be thus expreſſed: "I am *He* who "*exiſts* by myſelf—the only *Being* which can properly be ſaid to *be*."—But I confeſs, that I have the ſame objection to this metaphyſical refinement, which I have to the interpretation of the author mentioned in the ſecond Note below.

There is yet one verſion more which deſerves attention. It is that of Bate: "I will be, "what I have been:" that is, I will be the ſame to them as I was to their foreſathers; their friend and protector.—I was once ſo well pleaſed with this tranſlation, that, if I could have found inſtances where the word והיה has the ſame power with converſive *vau*, of changing *future* into *paſt* time, I believe I ſhould have adopted it; or at leaſt ſomething ſimilar; namely

* Houbigant: *Ego is ero, qui olim futurus ſum*; hardly intelligible, any more than that of Le Cene: *Je ſerai, car je ſerai.* † I have ſometimes thought that they may have uſed the word *that* as a conjunction, for *becauſe*: in which caſe they would coincide in opinion with the author of *Eſſays and Commentaries*; who, after reporting the common renderings, adds: "I ſhould rather turn the paſſage thus: *I am, becauſe I am*: that is, I am without any cauſe "of exiſtence but in my own nature—I am ſelf-exiſtent, and neceſſarily exiſtent... If any ſhould think this verſion as "identical a propoſition as thoſe mentioned above, I believe, on a fair trial, it will be found otherwiſe. Any perſon "may truly ſay: *I am that*, or *what I am*; and nobody would diſpute it with him: but he could not ſay with the "like truth *I am, becauſe I am*, in the ſtrict and proper ſenſe of the word *becauſe*: as his being is not owing to any thing "inherent in it and inſeparable from his exiſtence in itſelf conſidered, but to a cauſe without himſelf, and independent "on him. But with reſpect to God, who exiſts in dependence on no external cauſe, who is neceſſarily exiſtent in the "ſtricteſt ſenſe; no other reaſon can be aſſigned for his exiſtence, but that he exiſts by a neceſſity of nature: he exiſts, "and will exiſt, becauſe of, or by reaſon of, his ſelf-exiſtence—he hath exiſted—he doth exiſt, and he will exiſt—be"cauſe he *muſt* exiſt, and *cannot* ceaſe to exiſt, is all that can be ſaid of exiſtence."—I have no doubt but ſome of my readers will reliſh this mode of interpretation.—To me it appears too metaphyſical.

"I am

"I am what I have *always* been:"—the ſame immutable Being. But as I have not been able to find a ſingle example of ſuch a converſive power, I deemed it better to tranſlate litterally: "I will be, what I will be:" and leave to commentators to find as much myſtery in the terms, as they pleaſe.—I will only ſubjoin the ſenſible remark of Dathe, which I have partly expreſſed in my Explanatory Note. "Hæc verba non ſunt nomen, quod Deus ſibi tribuat; nam in "ſequenti verſu ſe Jovam vocat; neque uſquam legitur EIEH ut nomen Dei. Sed hic "ſenſus eſſe videtur: Quocunque me nomine appellent Iſraelitæ, præſtabo me et exhibebo ut "Deum."

The repetition of *I will be*, אהיה, in the ſame verſe is only an abridgment of the former *I will be what I will be*; thus well explained by Roſenmüller: "Ille Deus qui dixit mihi, quum "rogarem nomen ejus, *Ero, qui ero*; is Deus, inquam, me miſit ad vos."—Houbigant indeed exclaims againſt the preſent reading, as a barbariſm: and, inſtead of אהיה *I will be*, reads הוה, the participle called *benoni*, with the relative prefix ה: which he thinks was the reading of Sep. and Vulg. the former rendering ὁ ὢν, the latter *qui eſt*. But theſe are weak reaſons for departing from the preſent reading, which is in all the copies of both Sam. and Hebr. and was certainly read by Syr. Onk. Tharg. and Perſ. as they all retain the very Hebrew word; and by Gr. Ven. which has εσομαι πεπομφε με προς υμας. Nay, I ſuſpect all the other tranſlators to have read in the ſame manner*. That the Septuagint read הוה, their tranſlating it into ὁ ὢν is no proof. They had done the ſame by אהיה, in the preceding comma. With regard to the *qui eſt* of Jerom, it is certainly a more litteral rendering of הוה than of אהיה: but we know his manner of tranſlating too well, to affirm, that he *muſt* have read the former in his copy.

Ver. 15. *He that will be.* יהוה. This is ſtill a play upon the foregoing words: only the third perſon is uſed inſtead of the firſt, and the *jod* converted into a *vau* to give it the form of a noun. The Rabbis indeed tell us, that there is much myſtery in all this; and that the word יהוה includes all time, paſt, preſent, and to come. The *jod* indicates the future, the *cholem* the preſent, and the *kametz*, forſooth, the paſt: and this, ſay our Chriſtian commentators, is expreſſed in the Revelation of John, by ὁ ὢν, και ὁ ἦν, και ὁ ἐρχομενος†.—It is not unlikely, that the author of the Apocalypſe might have adopted this idea from the Rabbis of his day: but I doubt much if it ever were in the mind of the writer of Exodus; any more than the abſurd notion, that the word יהוה was not to be pronounced.—But how was it pronounced? That, indeed, I know not: for the ſuperſtition of the latter Jews, I mean after the Babyloniſh Captivity‡, having every where ſubſtituted for it, in pronunciation, the word אדוני *Adonai*; and the Greek interpreters having always rendered it Κυριος: we have no ſufficient means left to enable us to know how it was originally pronounced. Its common modern pronunciation is *Jehovah*; which Bate

* The readings of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion are loſt: and Saadias omits the whole comma.

† From Plutarch (De Iſide) we learn, that an inſcription on the temple of an Egyptian Goddeſs, which he imagines to have been Minerva, was couched in theſe terms: "I am all that was, and is, and is to be: and no mortal has removed my veil"—And in the Text of the *Bhágavat*, the following words are believed to have been pronounced by the Supreme Being to Brahmá: "Even I was even at firſt, not any other thing; that which exiſts, unperceived; "ſupreme: afterwards *I am that which is*; and he, who muſt remain, am I." Litteral verſion by Sir William Jones, in Aſiat. Reſearches, vol. 1. p. 245. ‡ At leaſt before Joſephus, who expreſsly ſays that it was not lawful for him to ſpeak of the name by which God had revealed himſelf to Moſes, περι ἧς [προσηγοριας] ου μοι θεμις ειπειν.

and

and moſt of our later tranſlators have every where ſubſtituted for *the Lord*.—Of foreign verſions, the Tigurine has *Jehovah*; Junius, Le Clerc, and Michaëlis, *Jehova* *; Caſtalio, Dathe, and moſt of the latter Germans, *Jova*.—I believe that not one of all theſe is the original pronunciation of יהוה.—Diodorus Siculus† ſays, that Moſes called the author of his laws IAO—τον Ιαω. Alex. Trallianus gives us a charm or exorciſm againſt the gout in theſe words: "I adjure thee by the great name of IAOTH *Sabaoth*, Ιαωθ‡ Σαβαωθ.—Sanchoniathon‖ ſays, that what he wrote concerning the Jews, he had from Jerombal, a prieſt of the God Ιευω. This I conſider as nearly the genuine pronunciation: for I am greatly inclined to believe that before the Babyloniſh captivity the Jews of Paleſtine pronounced the word IEUE: but from their reſidence among the Chaldeans, who ſpoke, if I may ſo ſay, a Doric dialect, and uſed the א where the Hebrews uſed the ה; the latter came gradually to give into a ſimilar pronunciation; and although in their Hebrew Scriptures they retained the *he*, yet they gave it in reality the power of an *aleph*. Hence the punctuators marked it with a *kametz*. This is mere conjecture, I allow; but it is a conjecture, which I have endeavoured to make highly probable, in my *Comparative Grammar* of the Oriental Tongues; which I hope to have yet the means and leiſure of giving to the Public.

But to return to יהוה. Jerom tells us, in his Comment. on Pſ. 8. that the name of the Lord in Hebrew is compoſed of the letters *jod, he, vau, he*; and may be read IAHO; which correſponds with the Ιαω of Diodorus.—We learn from Photius, Ep. 162. that the Jews pronounced it AIA; but the Samaritans IABE, i. e. IAUE. He adds: γραφεται δε γραμμασι τουτοις: Ιωθ, αλεφ, ουαυθ, ηθ: where remark that the θ in the two laſt letters is paragogic; as in Ιαωθ, mentioned in the laſt note but one below. It is worthy of remark, that in the Conſtantinopolitan edition of a Spaniſh verſion made by the Jews the word יהוה is thus expreſſed IEÏA: but which, in the Ferrara edition of the ſame work is changed into *Adonai*. See Le Long, vol. 1. p. 365.—The oblique caſes of the Latin *Jupiter*, particularly the ablative *Iove*, ſeems to be derived from יהוה.—So much on the pronunciation of יהוה.—Let us next ſee how it has been rendered by thoſe tranſlators, who choſe not to retain the name itſelf.—Sep. ὁ Κυριος.—Vulg. *Dominus*.—Onk. Tharg. and Perſic ייי.—Syr. מריא.—The Sam. verſion and both Arabs generally change it into words that denote *God*.—Gr. Ven. Οντωτης.—Moſt moderns have, from Pagninus downward, followed the Antients: and expreſs יהוה by *Dominus, the Lord*.—The French Genevans have *l'Eternel*; and Le Cene, *le Souverein*.

I have, with all our Engliſh verſions prior to the preſent century, preferred *the* LORD; for two reaſons: Firſt, the word *Jehovah* is a barbarous ſound authoriſed by no authority, ſave the very ambiguous one of the vowel-points; and is made much more barbarous by our mode of pronouncing it: for we ſhould write and ſpeak either *Iehovah*, as we pronounce *Iambic*; or write with the Welch *Yehovah*.—But, in truth, we have learned from the French to murder every Hebrew, Greek, and Latin name which begins by the letter *I* followed by a vowel: as *Jacob, Jeremiah, John, Jerom*; and even the venerable name JESUS. Secondly, becauſe we

* In the Greek *Catechiſm* or *Orthodox Confeſſion of Faith*, the name is written Ιεχωϖα: from a very common mutation of the Hebrew *he* into *chi*, and *vau* into *beta*. † L. i. p. 48. ‡ The θ in Ιαωθ is a mere paragogic, not unuſual among the Greeks. ‖ Apud Euſeb. Præp. Evang. l. i. c. 9.

cannot

cannot with any propriety tranſlate the Κυριος of the New Teſt. by *Jehovah:* even in the quotations from the Old: for theſe are almoſt all made from the Septuagint verſion. Since then the Κυριος of the N. T. where it denotes the Supreme Being, is the ſame with יהוה of the Old, which the Jews themſelves in their earlieſt verſion render Κυριος; is it not better to retain this latter throughout a vernacular tranſlation of both; than to write and read *Jehovah* in the one, and *the Lord* in the other, as if they were two different Gods?

Ib. *This ſhall be my name for ever.* This, I think, alludes not to יהוה; but to the *titles* preceding: *the God of Abraham*, &c. The meaning I take to be this; that whatſoever name I am called by, all future generations ſhall know me by the name of the *God of Abraham*, the *God of Iſaac* and the *God of Jacob*.

Ib. *And this my memorial.* וזה זכרי. It is not eaſy to expreſs the full force of the word זכר. Hence Michaëlis and Dathe were content with paraphraſing thus: "und ſo will ich zu allen "zeiten genannt werden"—"*Sic, per omnes ætates, me vocabitis:*" as if it were only a repetition of the preceding comma. But it is, certainly, more than that: it is admirably well expreſſed by the μνημοσυνον of Sep. which is alſo the rendering of Gr. Ven.: but not quite ſo well by Jerom's *memoriale*; which, however, our tranſlators borrowed for want of a more explicit term. Perhaps *remembrancer* might not improperly be ſubſtituted. The name of the *God of Abraham, Iſaac and Jacob* was to be a continual *pledge* for his protecting their poſterity, as his own peculiar people: for in that light the Hebrew hiſtorian meant the words to be taken.

Ver. 18. *The Lord, the God of the Hebrews, is* the God *whom we invoke.* The preſent Hebrew has יהוה אלהי העבריים נקרה עלינו; which, in our common verſion, is rendered: "The Lord "God of the Hebrews *hath met with us.*" But all the Samaritan copies, and 27 Heb. MSS. and the Text itſelf in p. p. ch. 5. 3.* have a different reading, namely נקרא the paſſive voice of קרא, inſtead of נקרה. I know the two verbs are ſometimes confounded in the preſent Text; and that קרא has the meaning of קרה about 18 times in the whole Hebrew Scripture; but neither of theſe verbs, in the ſignification of *meeting* or *befalling*, is ever conſtructed with the prepoſition על; whereas קרא, when it means to *call, invoke*, is in its paſſive voice or Niphal moſt frequently ſo conſtructed; and always, I believe, when it is uſed to expreſs the relation between God and his people. So Deut. 28. 10. שם יהוה נקרא עליך, rendered by our Engliſh tranſlators "Thou art called by the name of the Lord," i. e. The Lord is he, whom thou invokeſt, and worſhippeſt. So Jerem. 14. 9. ושמך עלינו נקרא *Thy name is called upon us.* See alſo 2 Chron. 7. 14. Iſ. 63. 19. Amos 9. 12. Dan. 9. 18.—This conſideration alone determines the true reading נקרא and its true meaning here; without the aid of MSS. or any other authority. Onk. and Jonathan ſo read and underſtood: for they have both אתקרי עלנא *invocatus eſt ſuper nos*, in the ſame ſort of conſtruction as the Hebrew; although the Latin tranſlator of Tharg. has falſely rendered *occurrit nobis.*—The Septuagint and Jerom ſeem either to have read קרא לנו, or to have given a conjectural and uncommon meaning to the preſent reading; as the former render προσκεκληται ἡμας; the latter *vocavit nos:* but ſtill they muſt have taken the verb קרא not in the ſenſe of *meeting*—but of *calling* or *invoking*.—And indeed any other ſenſe appears to me abſurd. For what ſenſe is there in ſaying: "The God of the Hebrews (*i. e.* our own God)

* Where, however, 6 MSS. have נקרה.

"hath met with us?"—Hence thoſe interpreters who ſeem to have had the reading נקרה before them have been obliged to diſtort it to meanings which it cannot admit. Thus Syr. and Arab. Erp. *hath revealed himſelf to us.* Saad. *hath given us a charge.* And, among the moderns, Dathe: *apparuit nobis.* Michaëlis: "iſt uns erſchienen."—How much more ſenſibly Luther followed the Vulg. and Sep. "hat uns gerufen;" which, at leaſt, makes a congruous ſenſe: although the preſent reading can hardly bear it.—On the whole, then, I am clearly of opinion that the meaning of the comma is: "We adore not, nor invoke the deities of Egypt—The "God of the Hebrews, is the God who is invoked by us: let us therefore go at ſome diſtance "from the Egyptians, that we may without moleſtation worſhip our own God, after our own "manner."

Ver. 19. *But by compulſion.* Lit. *but by a ſtrong hand.* The preſent Hebr. Text has, *not even by a ſtrong hand,* ולא ביד חזקה; which the ſticklers for its integrity defend thus: the *ſtrong hand* is the firſt *nine* plagues, which were not effectual to obtain permiſſion for the Iſraelites to go out of Egypt! But the *tenth* produced that effect. This is truly an odd manner of defending a manifeſt blunder; of which there is not, as far as I recollect, a ſingle ſimilar example.—Read ולוא or ולא with Sam. Sep. and Vulg.—The error crept into the Hebrew Text, from the great reſemblance of *he* and *vau* in the old alphabet.—An hundred inſtances of a like commutation might be pointed out.

CHAP. IV.

Ver. 6. *PUT thine hand into thy boſom.* The robes of the Eaſterns are wide, and tied about the middle with a cincture, which leaves above a capacious ſinuoſity of ſuperfluous cloth, not ineptly called a *boſom.* The Latins uſed *ſinus* in the ſame ſenſe.

Ver. 16. *As a mouth,* לפה. Thus Homer is, by the ſweet bard Moſchus, called *the mouth of Calliopé*—

απολετο πρεων τοι Ὁμηρος
Τηνο το Καλλιοπης γλυκερον ςομα. Epitaph. Bion. 73. 74.

Ib. *Thou ſhalt to him be as a God.* אתה תהיה לו לאלהים. Thus paraphraſed by Sep. συ δε αυτῳ εση τοι προς τον Θεον; imitated by Jerom.: *Tu autem eris ei in his quæ ad Deum pertinent:* but neither verſion expreſſes the original. Better Gr. Ven. συ δε υπαρξεις εκεινῳ εις Θεον. Onk. Perſ. and both Arabs change the word *God* into equivalents: רב—אסתאדא—אסתאד—*מעלמא *maſter, inſtructor, preceptor*; all mollified terms, to exclude the idea of *godſhip* from Moſes: but this was not neceſſary, as the word אלהים *God* is expreſſive of *ſuperior power,* wherever it be lodged. Hence the Syr. tranſlator ſcrupled not to render it here by אלהא.

Ver. 21. *I will ſo harden his heart,* &c. ואני אחזק את לבו. Sep. εγω δε σκληρυνω την καρδιαν αυτου. Vulg. *ego indurabo cor ejus:* and to the ſame purport all the Antient verſions; ſave that Syr. Aquila and Sym. mollify the term אחזק a little—אעשן—ενισχυσω—θρασυνω. Gr. Ven. κρατυνω.—All this ſounds harſh to our ear, as it ſeems to make God the author of ſin: and our

* This term uſed by Saadias is Perſic, not Arabic.

Theologians

Theologians have been at much pains to ſhew, that it is a mere oriental *metonymy*. Thoſe who wiſh to ſee all that can well be ſaid on the ſubject may conſult Dathe's edition of Glaſſius's *Philologia Sacra*, l. 1. p. 242. or Roſenmüller's Scholia, vol. i. p. 379.—After all it now to me appears, that the more antient Jews, I mean before the Babyloniſh captivity, really believed that all *evil* as well as *good* came immediately from God. I was once of a different opinion, which I have too ſtrongly expreſſed in my Explanatory Note; which, conſequently, is at variance with this Remark. But I always write from actual conviction, and ſhall never be aſhamed to acknowledge my known errors and miſtakes. See the C. R. on 2 Sam. 24. 1. and compare ch. 14. 17.—Deut. 2. 30.: 4. 19.: 18. 14.: 29. 25.—Joſh. 11. 20.—2 Sam. 14. 10.—2 K. 3. 10.—Iſa. 44. 18.—Jerem. 4. 10.—Ezek. 14. 9.: 20. 25.: 39. 2.—Pſ. 105. 25. —But the fataliſm of the Jews cannot arraign the goodneſs or juſtice of the Deity, any more than the fataliſm of the Greeks and Mahomedans.—At any rate, whether the Jews were fataliſts or not, a tranſlator ſhould not take the liberty to change his Text, under pretence of reconciling it to modern Theology, as Dathe has done: "Ego vero *permittam*, ut animo ob- "firmato populum demittere recuſet."—Much more properly Michaëlis: "Ich aber will ſein "herz verharten." See his excellent Note on this paſſage in his German Verſion of the Bible.

Ver. 22. *Iſrael is my ſon, my firſt-born.* A ſtrong metaphor, denoting that the Lord conſidered the Iſraelites as his favourite choſen people. Hence Sep. in the next comma renders בני *my ſon* by τον λαον μου, *my people.*

Ver. 24. *The Lord met him*, &c. The word rendered *met* is not קרה, but פגש. which in Arab. ſignifies *irruere*; and in this ſenſe it is here taken by Saadias: "The Lord, or (as Sep. Onk. Tharg. and both Arabs have it) "the angel of the Lord, *attacked* him," &c.—This angel or meſſenger was, no doubt, ſome ſudden dangerous malady, which happened to Moſes in his journey from Midian to Egypt, probably at the very firſt lodging-place he came to: and as all maladies were ſuppoſed to be the puniſhment of ſome tranſgreſſion*, it was natural to impute this one to the neglect of *circumciſion*; which the mother, with reluctance, now performs, to ſave her huſband's life.

Ver. 25. *A ſharp knife.* Better, perhaps, *a ſharp ſtone*, or *flint*, צור: for flints and ſhells were antiently uſed as knives and other edged tools; and, at this day, ſuch knives are uſed in circumciſion by ſome Æthiopian tribes.

Ib. *Throwing herſelf at his feet.* The Text is ותגע לרגליו, *and touched his feet.* Whoſe feet? Thoſe of Moſes, ſay the generality of interpreters—Thoſe of her ſon, ſay De Lyra and Bonfrerius.—Druſius, Glaſſius, and Roſenmüller likewiſe refer רגלי to the ſon; but think it means here not the *feet*, but the *part* that had been juſt circumciſed, and ſtill reeking with blood; a very fanciful and far-fetched interpretation.—More abſurd ſtill is the opinion of ſome Rabbis and the Thargumiſts, that the feet of the threatening angel are here deſignated.—With reſpect to ותגע, or as 4 Sam. MSS. have it, ותגיע, I have without the ſmalleſt heſitation followed Sep. προσεπεσε προς τους ποδας αυτου. The Vulg. *tetigit pedes ejus*, and the Syr. אחדת ברגלוהי

* This idea remained among the Jews long after their return from Babylon. "Which ſinned?" ſaid the diſciples of Jeſus;—"this man? or his parents? that he was born blind!" John 9. 2.

ſhe laid hold of his feet, are indeed more litteral, but have the ſame meaning. Ziphora placed herſelf in the ſame attitude with regard to Moſes, as the two Marys did with regard to Jeſus, when he met them after his reſurrection: "They laid hold of his feet, and worſhipped him." Mat. 28. 9.—The conduct of Ziphora was that of a tender mother, and a loving reſpectful wife: her ſpeech is not a ſpeech of reproach or indignation, but of uxorial endearment. By theſe words "a blood-bought ſpouſe art thou to me" ſhe ſeems to ſay: See how dearly I love thee! ſince, for thy ſake, I have ſacrificed the blood of my ſon, contrary to my maternal feelings and the practice of my country!—I know that ſome commentators, among whom our Stackhouſe, refer the word חתן *ſpouſe* to the child: and "this (ſays Delgado) alludes to a "cuſtom among the Jews, of calling a child that is circumciſed a bridegroom*." Aben-Ezrah held the ſame opinion; juſtly ſcouted by Houbigant and Secker; whoſe MS. note on the paſſage I here ſubjoin. "It is wonderful (ſays he), if Moſes wrote this account, that he ſhould "not have added explanatory circumſtances. Poſſibly the ſon here mentioned was but lately "born, and ſince Moſes received his commiſſion; and his mother had oppoſed his being cir-"cumciſed at the regular time, becauſe of the journey: which reaſon Moſes might ſee to be "inſufficient; yet, through exceſs of tenderneſs, comply with her deſire: and it being material, "that he who went on ſuch a high meſſage, ſhould be accurate and exemplary in obſerving "the law of God, God might appear to him in a threatning manner, and to Zipporah at the "ſame time; which might well bring her to perform the command, in the haſte here deſcribed, "though not without words expreſſing uneaſineſs. Some think that ſhe calls him *bridegroom*, "as having by this action ſaved his life, and ſecured him to herſelf anew. Houbigant obſerves "well, that ſhe could not, as ſome imagine, call her ſon *bridegroom*, as being by circumciſion "eſpouſed to God: for God is never repreſented as the female ſpouſe."—For the reſt, Houbigant ſuſpected that a *jod* may have been dropped out of the word בנה, and that the original reading was בניה *her ſons*. It is clear from ver. 20. that Moſes took both his ſons with him; and it is not improbable that both of them were then uncircumciſed†; otherwiſe it would not have been a novelty to Ziphora.—If בניה were the genuine reading, it would certainly leave no ambiguity in the Text, as the affix in רגליו could then be referable to Moſes only: but there is no variety of lection either in the Sam. or Heb. copies; and all the Verſions have alſo the ſingular.—I am inclined to think that the ſingular here ſtands for the plural; as חמר *an aſs*, in v. 20. evidently ſignifies *ſeveral aſſes*; and as עץ in Gen. 1. 11. denotes all ſorts of trees.

Ver. 26. The Lord *then let him eſcape*. וירף ממנו. Lit. *and he departed from him*. Now, as no explicit nominative is prefixed to the verb, it has been differently ſupplied. The Ant. verſions

* Delgado's verſion is: "Zipporah took a ſharp ſtone, and cut off the foreſkin of her ſon, *which reached his feet*: "then ſhe ſaid, &c."—I add, on account of its peculiarity, the verſion of Bate: "And Jiporeh took a knife, and cut "off the foreſkin of her ſon; and ſhe laid *it* at his feet; and ſaid: Surely thou *art* a father by blood to me." On which he has this curious Note: "More was explained to them on this occaſion, than is mentioned, as is plain becauſe Ji-"poreh knew what would appeaſe Jehovah, viz. circumciſion: for when ſhe laid the foreſkin at the feet of Jehovah, "he deſiſted from his attempt on Moſes: and Jehovah was now father to her, the mother of the children of God by "the blood of the circumciſion." Rare mode of interpreting, this! † The Bab. Thargum, indeed, tells us, that Eliezer had been circumciſed in conſequence of an agreement between Moſes and his father-in-law; but that the latter would not allow Gerſhom to undergo that operation.

leave

leave the word in the ſame ambiguity, ſave that the Complut. edition of Sep. and the Oxford MS. have ὁ ἀγγελος; and ſo it was underſtood by the Thargumiſts. Delgado ſupplies *it*, that is, the malady, "which is underſtood, though not expreſſed:" and this is a common interpretation among the Jews. De Lyra, Eſtius, and even the great Grotius imagined that the nominative is Ziphora, and accordingly render *ſhe left him*; i. e. ſhe returned to her father's houſe. But they attended not to the little circumſtance of the verb's being maſculine, without any variety of lection, ſave that one faulty MS. has ידה.—That Ziphora returned with the children to her father's houſe is indeed certain, from ch. 18. 2. and it is highly probable, that ſhe returned on this occaſion; but this cannot be inferred from the verb here uſed; nor can it refer to her at all. Grotius muſt not have conſulted the original; but was deceived by the Greek απηλθεν, or by Pagninus's *receſſit*; both which admit equally a feminine or maſculine nominative.—I am firmly of opinion, then, that *the Lord*, or *the angel*, is the nominative to be ſupplied, although I am perſuaded that the phraſe means no more, than that the malady was not mortal, and was now come to a happy criſis.

Before I leave this verſe, I muſt make one remark more, on the very ſingular manner in which the words חתן דמים אתה לי are rendered in Sep. namely, εστη το αἱμα της περιτομης του παιδιου μου. How they could draw this out of the Hebrew, is inconceivable; even if we ſuppoſe them to have read חתם for חתן: for how can דמים אתה לי be converted, by any means, into το αἱμα της περιτομης του παιδιου μου, *the blood of my child's circumciſion?* It baffles all conjecture, Such another wild paraphraſe is not, I think, to be found in all the Greek Verſion; at leaſt in the Pentateuch. Yet this wild paraphraſe is in all the editions, and in all the MSS. which I have had occaſion to ſee; as alſo in the Copt. and Ital. verſions, made from the Greek. It is thus quoted by Auſtin: "Stetit ſanguis circumciſionis infantis mei."—Perhaps ſome of Dr. Holmes's MSS. will give us ſome variety of lection; although I have little hopes of their clearing up the matter.—I juſt now learn from Dr. Holmes himſelf, that there is no important variety of reading.

Ver. 27. *And kiſſed him.* וישק לו. Sep. Vat. Compl. Alex. have κατεφιλησαν αλληλους, *they kiſſed one another.* But Ald. and 28 MSS. have κατεφιλησεν αυτον: and ſo Copt. This then is probably the genuine reading.

CHAP. V.

Ver. 3. *LET us go*, &c. This was a mere pretext; but well calculated to induce Pharaoh to comply with ſo fair a demand: for it was a common opinion among all the nations of antiquity, that the neglect of ſacrifices and religious feſtivals was puniſhed by war, peſtilence, and other calamities; nor did the Hebrew legiſlator attempt to remove a prejudice ſo deeply rooted; as the attempt in all probability would have been vain. *The worſhipping of God in ſpirit and truth*, was a doctrine not yet known: to our divine legiſlator, JESUS, it was reſerved to promulge ſo pure a religious worſhip; whoſe followers, however, too ſoon loſt ſight of it, and judaized, I might ſay paganized, even in the firſt ages of Chriſtianity; or, at leaſt, as ſoon as Chriſtianity became the eſtabliſhed religion of the State.

Ver. 6. *Inferiour officers.* שטרים. Sep. γραμματεις, *Scribes.* They, no doubt, kept a regiſter of

of the labourers, and portioned out their ſeveral taſks: but they were accountable to their Egyptian taſkmaſters, נגשים.

Ver. 7. *Straw to make brick.* The ſtraw was chopped ſmall, and mixed with the clay, to give it a greater coherence. Our mud-walls are formed of ſimilar materials, although theſe are not worked into bricks, but layered into one maſs. Thoſe bricks were not burned in kilns, but dried in the ſun. See Harmer, vol. i. p. 176.

Ver. 9. *That to it they may attend.* The preſent Hebrew Text has ויעשו בה *et faciant in eo*; what our tranſlators render "that they may labour therein." But I prefer the Sam. reading וישעו, which was that of Sep. Onk. Syr. Tharg. and Saadias; and is far more agreeable to the context.

Ver. 14. Some have imagined that גם תמול, in this verſe, is an interpolation; and the Sep. verſion ſeems to favour this opinion; as it has only καθαπερ χθες και τριτην ημεραν, και το σημερον. So alſo Vulg. *ſicut priùs, nec heri, nec hodie.* But the words are in all the copies of Sam. and Heb. and in all the other Ant. verſions; although they diſappear in the Polyglott Latin verſion of Onkelos: ſo that there is little doubt, I think, of their having originally ſtood in the Text. The firſt תמול refers to time paſt in general, the ſecond תמול to the preceding day.

Ver. 16 *Although the fault be in thine own people.* The original, וחטאת עמך, is ambiguous, and has been variouſly underſtood and rendered. The Septuagint took וחטאת for the ſecond perſ. ſing. of חטא, and עם for a noun: αδικησεις συν τον λαον σου "Thou wrongeſt thy people." So equivalently Vulg. and Syr.; and one of Kennicott's MSS. לעמך ſeems to favour this reading. But all the other copies, both Heb. and Sam. have עמך or עמיך; neither of which admits eaſily the above Greek verſion.—Onk. Tharg. Perſ. and both Arabs either read חטא עמך *populus tuus peccat*; or conſidered וחטאת as a noun, although they rendered it as a verb: and this, I think, is the more probable, as Aquila, a moſt verbal tranſlator, has και αμαρτιαι λαῳ σου; and Theod. και η αμαρτια εις τον λαον σου; which however is a ſomewhat ambiguous verſion, and may be conſtrained to bear a meaning ſimilar to that of Sep. Symmachus took עם for a prepoſition, and renders accordingly, though not litterally, και αμαρτιαν εχεις. So the Sam. verſion ועובתה עמך *The fault is with thee.* But Houbigant, I believe, is the only modern, of any note, who has adopted this meaning: *Et culpa ad teipſum redundat.* It is not at all probable, that the Iſraelites would lay the blame directly on the ſovereign, but rather on his ſervants.

There is another interpretation, firſt broached by Pagninus, and followed by Luther, Caſtalio, Druſius, the Genevans*, Diodati, and moſt vernacular tranſlators. They ſuppoſe וחטאת to be here taken for the *puniſhment of ſin*; and render "*et punitur populus tuus*"—"thus thy "people are puniſhed;" or ſome ſuch term. Luth. "und dein volk muſs ſünder ſeyn." Diod. "et il tuo populo e inculpato."—I have little doubt, that וחטאת is here to be conſidered as a noun in *regimen* with עם, and that this latter ſignifies *people:* ſo that the litteral verſion would in Latin be, "tamen, peccatum *eſt* populi tui;"—or, as the Greek verſion of Venice well has it, η δε αμαρτια του σου λεω†.

* That is, the firſt Geneva editions: which have "Ton peuple eſt puni, comme ayant peché:" but in the laſt reviſal, the comma is well rendered "et c'eſt la faute de ton peuple." Well the Spaniſh of Ferrara, made by ſome Jews: "y *es* pecado de tu pueblo." † This tranſlator often atticizes.

Ver. 17.

Ver. 17. I have added the words *our God*, in this verſe, on the authority of one MS. and Sep. although the latter has only τῳ Θεῳ ἡμων*, without Κυριῳ. It is a repetition of part of v. 3. and would moſt probably be originally expreſſed in the ſame manner. Four Heb. MSS. with Targ. Arab. Erp. and one of De Roſſi's MSS. of Onk. have *our God*, inſtead of *the Lord*. I am perſuaded, therefore, that אלהינו ſtood originally in the Text after יהוה.

Ver. 19. *Not aught . . . ſhall be diminiſhed.* The preſent Text has לא תגרעו, *ye ſhall not diminiſh*: but I prefer the Sam. reading יגרע; which Jerom followed:—*non minuetur*. The other Ant. interpreters, however, read in the plural. It is all the ſame as to the ſenſe: although I think the Sam. reading more idiomatical.

CHAP. VI.

Ver. 2. *AGAIN the Lord ſpoke.* The preſent Text has אלהים *God*, and ſo Sep. both Arabs and Gr. Ven. But Sam. Syr. Vulg. Onk. Targ. and 2 of De Roſſi's MSS. have יהוה; and 1 MS. has יהוה אלהים *the Lord God*.

Ver. 3. *Who manifeſted myſelf to Abraham, &c. as God the Omnipotent.* באל שדי. Although I have, with Jerom and the bulk of modern interpreters, rendered the word שדי *Omnipotent*, I am far from thinking that this is certainly its meaning. The antients vary in rendering it. Sep. Θεος ων αυτων, "*as* being their God."—What they ſaw in their copy, it is difficult to ſay†.—Syr. Onk. Targ. Bab. and Perſ. retain the Hebrew word שדי. Targ. Jer. has באלהא דשמיא *the God of the heavens*; and ſo the word is rendered in Sep. in the Pſalms: ὁ Θεος τȣ ȣρανȣ, and ὁ ἐπȣρανιος—Both Arabs have words denoting *ſuperior power—ſelf-ſufficiency*; and Jerom has *in Deo omnipotente*. The Greek of Venice: εν Θεῳ κρατειᾳ. Michaëlis heſitates between two ſignifications. The firſt he derives from the Arab. שדא, which in one of its inflections ſignifies *adſcendit ſummum rei—in ſummo conſedit*. In this caſe אל שדי will be *he who ſits the higheſt, ſummi cæli ſeſſor*; and equivalent to עליון *the Moſt High*. He has, accordingly, in his German Verſion, rendered it "allerhöchſte."—Dathe: *ſummi*.—But as the ſame Arab. word ſignifies *to weave*; *texere, ſtamina ducere*; אל שדי may mean the *great weaver* or *worker* of all created things: "Deus, creans omnia et regens, ſtamina ducere omnium rerum dicitur‡." To me this etymon appears too far-fetched.—Ikenius derives the word from the Arab. שד, which denotes *power, validus fuit, prævaluit*. This coincides with Vulg. and ſo it is often rendered in Sep. in the book of Job, παντοκρατωρ—and in Ezech. ισχυρος by Theodotion. The Greek of Venice agrees in the idea of *power*; but he ſeems to have taken אל for *power itſelf*; not for the *God of power*: as if the meaning were: "I manifeſted myſelf to Abraham, &c. in *power divine*‖.—I have already obſerved that moſt moderns have adopted Jerom's verſion; particularly all our Engliſh tranſlators before Bate; who renders שדי *all-bountiful*. He derives the word from שדה *to pour forth*: "q. d. *the pourer or ſhedder forth* of bleſſings, both temporal and ſpiritual."

* Compl. has τῳ Κυριῳ ἡμων. † Some have imagined they read, at leaſt in Gen. 28. 3. and 43. 14. not שדי but שלי, for אשר לי, becauſe they render it Θεος μου; but beſides that it is not clear that ever ש ſtands for אשר in the Pentateuch, the Septuagint could not *here* read שלי, as they render Θεος ων αυτων; and Gen. 18. 1. Θεος σȣ.

‡ Michaëlis Supplem. p. 2284. ‖ "Hebraiſmus eſt (ſays Munſter) pro *omnipotentia divina*." So alſo Clarius.—Oleaſter

—Oleaſter thought the word might be derived from שד *a pap:* and that *a God of paps* means a bountiful nouriſhing God. This accords with Bate's and Parkhurſt's interpretation.—Some few have made שדי a compound of ש and די; aud render *he who is ſufficient.* This is, in my apprehenſion, the leaſt probable of all derivations.—Let me now add my own conjectures; on which, however, I lay little ſtreſs. I once thought I had found the original meaning of שדי in the Syr. שודי *promiſit:* and if this were really the root, the ſenſe here would be, that God had manifeſted himſelf to Abraham, Iſaac, and Jacob only as a *promiſer* of good things: but that now he would be what he then promiſed.—But, perhaps, a ſtill better etymon may be found in the Ethiopic SADI, which ſignifies *benignity:* ſo that אל שדי may denote a *benign, bounteous God*; which verſion coincides with Bate's, although drawn from a different origin.—*Verbum non amplius addam.*

1b. *But my name IEVE* [Jehovah] *to them I did not manifeſt.* ושמי יהוה לא נודעתי להם. So both Heb. and Sam. Texts without any notable variety of reading; and ſo, negatively, all the Ant. verſions, ſave Saadias, who has this ſingular rendering ואסמי אללה *But God is my name.*—But how can the name *Jehovah* be ſaid *not to have been manifeſted* to the more antient patriarchs, when it occurs ſo frequently in their hiſtory? With reſpect to the mere hiſtorical narrative, the anſwer is obvious: the Hebrew hiſtorian, whoever he was, to whom the name *Jehovah* was known, might without any impropriety uſe it proleptically in ſpeaking of the patriarchs, and even in writing the hiſtory of the creation. But there are paſſages where the patriarchs themſelves are found addreſſing their God under the very name *Jehovah*; which they could not have done, if it had been unknown to them! Certainly not, and here lies the great difficulty in explaining the preſent paſſage. Two principal expedients have, by commentators, been employed to remove the difficulty. 1. It has been ſuppoſed, that לא is here equivalent to הלא; and that the comma ſhould be rendered: "and by my name Jehovah was I not manifeſted to them?" But this interpretation is not only contrary to the common rules of grammar, but deſtroys the analogy of the context: and would never have been thought of, but for the ſake of reconciling contradictions.—Another more ſubtile ſolution is given by Vatable, and retailed by Dathe and Roſenmüller. I ſhall give it in the very words of Vatable: "Quòd ſi quis contendat nomen "יהוה fuiſſe etiam patribus ante Moſen cognitum et uſitatum; nihilominus tamen erit hujus loci "ſententia, quòd Deus promiſerit quidem patribus terram Chanaan, non tamen impleverit tem- "poribus patrum: nunc autem reipſa impleturus ſit; ut confirmetur veritas nominis ſui, quo di- "citur יהוה, i. e. *conſiſtens, conſtans, firmus et verax in promiſſionibus ſuis.* In hanc ſententiam quidam "etiam magni nominis apud Hebræos exponit locum iſtum in hæc verba: 'Promiſi eis promiſ- "ſiones, et in omnibus eis dixi ad eos: Ego ſum Deus omnipotens: at in nomine meo יהוה non "ſum notus factus eis. Hîc non ſcribitur *Non notum feci*, ſed *Non notus factus ſum;* i. e. *non cog-* "*nitus factus ſum eis in proprietate veritatis meæ, propter quam vocatur nomen meum* יהוה; i. e. "VERAX, FIDELIS, CONSTANS: *quia ecce promiſi eis, et nondum præſtiti, ſeu confirmavi.*" Such is the amphibological language which eminent Jewiſh and eminent Chriſtian interpreters put in the mouth of the Lord.—But what then are we to ſay of thoſe paſſages where the patriarchs addreſs the Lord by his name Jehovah? We muſt ſay that they are corrupted paſſages, and that יהוה has ſlipt into them for אלהים or אדני. It is well known how often theſe words have been interchanged; and what variety of lection is in different copies, with reſpect to them,

them.—But let us review the ſeveral paſſages where the name Jehovah is put in the mouths of the patriarchs, before Moſes.—The firſt inſtance is an early one indeed: it is in Gen. 4. 1. where Heva is made to ſay קניתי איש את יהוה, litterally, "I have gotten a man Jehovah;" or, as ſome render, "from Jehovah." But here Sep. Vulg. and both Arabs have *God* inſtead of *Jehovah:* and I have no doubt that this is the genuine reading. See the Rem. on the place.—The next inſtance is that of Noah, Gen. 9. 26. who in his benediction of Shem ſays: ברוך יהוה אלהי שם commonly rendered "Bleſſed be the Lord God of Shem:" but which I render "Bleſſed of "the Lord be Shem!" leaving *the Lord* in the verſion, becauſe it is in all the Hebrew and Samaritan copies, and in all the verſions ſave the two Arabs: but believing it a real interpolation, as I have ſaid in my Rem. on that place.

The third inſtance is in Gen. 15. 2. where Abraham is made to ſay אדני יהוה *My Lord Jehovah.* But here there is a variety of lection to which I refer my reader at p. 94. of theſe Remarks. The ſame words occur again ver. 8. but here alſo is a variety of lection both in the Text and Verſions. Two MS. have "Jehovah, my Lord;" and two, with Vulg. Syr. Onk. have "Lord God."

The fourth inſtance is in Gen. 16. 2. where Sara is made to ſay: "Jehovah hath denied me children:" and here indeed there is no variety of lection; ſave that both Arabs have "God."—Again in ver. 5. the ſame Sara ſays: "May Jehovah be judge between me and "thee:" but here all the copies of Sep. as well as both Arabs, have "God."

In Gen. 19. 13. the angels ſay to Lot: "So great before Jehovah, &c." and "Jehovah hath ſent us, &c." and here the Arabs only have "God." In ver. 14. Lot uſes the ſame term, ſpeaking to his ſons-in-law; where again the Arabs only have "God."

In Gen. 22. 14. Abraham is made to call the altar which he builded on Mount Moria "IEVE-IRAE" *Jehovah will provide:* and here all the verſions, ſave the Arabs, have alſo "the "Lord."

In Gen. 24. 3. Abraham adjures his ſervant by "Jehovah:" nor is there here any variety of lection, ſave in the Arabs.—The ſame is the caſe in ver. 7. where Abraham ſays: "Jehovah, "the God of the heavens, &c."

In ver. 12. Abraham's ſervant ſays: "O Jehovah, the God of my maſter, &c." But here 2 MSS. have *Adoni* inſtead of *Jehovah*, and 1 MS. has *Adoni Jehovah*. The Arabs, as uſual, have "O God, the God of my maſter, &c."

In ver. 27. the ſame ſervant ſays: "Bleſſed be Jehovah, the God of my maſter, &c." where all the verſions accord: except the Arabs. So again in the ſame verſe: and in ver. 35. 40. 42. 48. 52. 56.

In Gen. 26. 28. Abimelech ſays to Iſaac: "We have clearly ſeen that *Jehovah* is with thee." Where the Arabs only have *God:* and yet it is highly improbable that a king of Paleſtine ſhould uſe the word *Jehovah.*

In Gen. 27. 7. Iſaac bids Eſau bring him veniſon: "That I may bleſs thee (ſays he) in the "preſence of *Jehovah*;" where the Arabs only have *God.*—In the ſame Ch. ver. 20. Jacob ſays: "*Jehovah*, thy God, put it (the veniſon) in my way." Here Vulg. has only *voluntas Dei tui.*—In ver. 27. Iſaac ſays that the fragrance of his ſon's garments is like the fragrance of a full-grown field "which *Jehovah* hath bleſſed."

In Gen. 28. 20, 21. Jacob twice mentions the name *Jehovah*; according to Sep. * and once according to all the copies, ſave the Arabs.

In Gen. 29. 32. Lea is made to ſay, on the birth of Reuben: "For *Jehovah* hath given me "a ſon." Here not only both Arabs, but alſo Syr. and Perſ. have GOD: and indeed it is barely credible that Lea would uſe the name *Jehovah*.—Yet in the next verſe ſhe is made to uſe it again; and likewiſe in ver. 35.; in both which places the Perſic verſion, a very litteral one, and both Arabs have *God*.—In Ch. 30. 18. ſhe ſays: "*God* [not *Jehovah*] hath given me my re- "ward." But here Onk.† and the Thargums have *Jehovah*.

In Gen. 30. 23. Rahel ſays: "*God* hath taken away my reproach:" but here Onk. and the Thargums, with 3 Heb. MSS. have *Jehovah*.—Again ver. 24. ſhe ſays: "May *Jehovah* add to "me, &c." but Sep. Syr. Perſ. and both Arabs have *God*.—In the ſame Ch. ver. 27. Laban ſays: "Jehovah, I gueſs, hath bleſſed me, &c." But Sep. Syr. Vulg. Perſ. and both Arabs have *God*: nor is it likely that Laban, a Syrian, would uſe the other name.—In ver. 30. Jacob ſays "Through my conduct *Jehovah* bleſſed thee:" where ſome copies of Sep. Perſ. and both Arabs have *God*. Some copies of Sep. have both, Κυριος ὁ Θεος; but moſt copies have Κυριος only.

In Gen. 31. 49. Laban ſays: "May *Jehovah* ſpy between me and thee, &c." but Sep. Perſ. and both Arabs have *God*.

In Gen. 32. 9. al. 10. Jacob ſays "Thou, *Jehovah*, who ſaidſt to me:" and to this agree all the verſions, ſave the two Arabs.

In Gen. 49. 18. Jacob ſays, or ſome one for him: "Jehovah! from thee I wait for ſalva- "tion:" but this has very much the air of an interpolation; as I have obſerved on that paſſage.

Theſe, if I miſtake not, are all the places where the Patriarchs, from Adam to Jacob incluſively, have directly mentioned the name *Jehovah*: and they are certainly more than enough to prove, that that name was known to them before the vocation of Moſes; if we were ſure that they had actually ſpoken the very words put in their mouths by the compilers, or copiers, of the Pentateuch. But who will affirm that this is the caſe? The number of places where אלהים and יהוה have been interchanged is very great; and the variety of lection between the Verſions and the Text, and between the copies of the Text itſelf, is aſtoniſhing. Need we wonder then, that the word יהוה, once become the peculiar name of the God of the Hebrews, ſhould, by hiſtorians poſterior to that period, be often ſubſtituted for the more antient and more general name אלהים, even in addreſſes to the Deity, or in relations concerning him? A prolepſis is readily granted with reſpect to the latter‡; and we muſt either grant it with reſpect to the former, or ſay that the writer of Exodus is in contradiction with the writer of Geneſis: for it is, in my apprehenſion, impoſſible to reconcile the paſſage of Exodus, that gave riſe to the above

* When I marked this Var. Read. I had not ſeen Gr. Ven. which here agrees with Sep. having ὁ ονπωτης ὁ Θεος. He muſt have read יהוה in his Hebrew copy, for he is a moſt literal tranſlator. † Wrongly rendered *Deus* in the Latin verſion. ‡ Nothing indeed is more common than ſuch a prolepſis. Who ſcruples to ſay that the excellent *Prelections on Hebrew Poeſy* were written by Biſhop Lowth; although we know he was no biſhop when he compoſed that work? Or that Pope Benedict XIV. was the author of a celebrated work *De Canoniſatione Sanctorum*; although he was only Cardinal Lambertini, when he wrote it?

obſervations,

obſervations, with the name *Jehovah*'s being known to the preceding patriarchs.—If the name *Jehovah* were known before it was here communicated to Moſes, and were the common appellation of the God of the Patriarchs, the queſtion of Moſes, Exod. 3. 13. was needleſs, was impertinent: for God had before told him, ver. 6. that he was "the God of his (Moſes's) fathers, "the God of Abraham, the God of Iſaac, and the God of Jacob." It is clear then that Moſes, by aſking what was the name of this ſame God of his fathers, knew not that he had any particular name; and that particular name *Jehovah* is now for the firſt time made known as the peculiar God of the Iſraelitic nation. All this is perfectly conformable to the preſent declaration, Exod. 6. 3. "I am Jehovah; who manifeſted myſelf (or appeared) to Abraham, Iſaac and "Jacob as *God the Omnipotent* אל שדי: but my name IEVE *(Jehovah)* to them I did not mani- "feſt."—In fact it is by the former name he calls himſelf to Abraham, Gen. 17. 1. אני אל שדי "I "am God, the Omnipotent."—To Jacob, Gen. 35. 11. he makes the ſame declaration; which Jacob himſelf alludes to in his laſt ſpeech to Joſeph, "God, the Omnipotent, appeared to me "at Luz." Gen. 48. 3. I know that in Gen. 28. 13. he is made to ſay: "I am *Jehovah*, "the God of thy fathers." But the word *Jehovah* is wanting in the beſt copies of Sep. and muſt be charged on the interpolators or correcting copyiſts of the Hebrew Text. For the general manner in which God announces himſelf to the patriarchs is, merely by calling himſelf the *God of their fathers*; as Gen. 28. 13.—or *the very God* of their fathers; as Gen. 46. 3.—or by denominating himſelf from the place of his appearance: as *the God of Bethel*, Gen. 30. 36. and 31. 13. and Jacob more than once denominates him by the ſame title. It is obſervable that, although the patriarch Joſeph mentions the name of God about twenty times; he never once mentions him by the name Jehovah. It may be ſaid that he abſtained from mentioning that name in Egypt, either not to give offence, or becauſe they would not have underſtood him; but what ſhall we ſay, when we ſee him uſing the ſame caution to his own brethren, after his making himſelf known to them? He tells them not that "*Jehovah* ſent him before them, for "their preſervation;" but "God," Gen. 45. 5. and repeats the ſame words in the verſes 7. 8. and 10.—A more remarkable inſtance ſtill is in Gen. 50. 17. and 19. In the former his brothers requeſt him to forgive their tranſgreſſion againſt him, becauſe they are the ſervants of his "father's God:" and in the latter, he deſires them not to fear: "for (ſays he) a reverer of "God am I."—Surely here was the place for uſing the name *Jehovah*, if that name was known either to Joſeph, or his brothers. Again, when in the ſame Ch. ver. 24. he adjures his brethren to carry his bones into the land of Chanaan; he ſays not: "*Jehovah* will certainly viſit you—" but "*God* will certainly viſit you;" and repeats the ſame words in the next verſe.

The benedictions of the patriarchs tend to eſtabliſh the ſame reaſoning. "May God, *the* "*Omnipotent*, אל שדי (ſays Iſaac to Jacob Gen. 28. 3.) bleſs thee and make thee fruitful.—"May "the God, whom *my fathers* worſhipped (ſays Jacob Gen. 48. 15.) the God who hath tended "me until this day, bleſs the lads."—And in the moſt ſolemn benediction of Joſeph, Gen. 49. 25. Jehovah is never mentioned—but "the God of Jacob"—"the God of his father"—"the Omnipotent," שדי.

It matters not whether theſe were the very words of Jacob and Iſaac, or of the poetical hiſtorian who put them in their mouths. The poetical hiſtorian muſt have made them ſpeak ſomething like the language of their age, and uſe terms that were then known. In ſhort, unleſs we

ſuppoſe the Pentateuch to be a compilation of jarring elements aſſemblaged by different hands, we muſt allow that the name *Jehovah* has been put in the mouths of the patriarchs prior to Moſes, and in the mouth of God himſelf, by ſome poſterior copier: for the ſame perſon who wrote the third verſe of the ſixth chapter of Exodus could not have been ſo inconſiſtent with himſelf, as to make the name Jehovah familiar to the patriarchs before that period.

Let me juſt add, that it is a ſtrong preſumption againſt the name *Jehovah* being known before Moſes, that it enters not into the proper names of either perſons or places; ſave in the name IEVE-IRAE, already noticed: whereas we find אל frequently in ſuch names. The very name of *Iſrael* himſelf is of that claſs. But very early indeed this uſage ſeems to have taken place. Two of Cain's ſons were ſo denominated, *Mehujael*, and *Methuſael*. Beſides theſe, we have in the book of Geneſis, *Mahalaleel*, *Iſhmael*, *Kemuel*, *Bethuel*, *Magdiel*, *Jahelel*, *Jemuel*, *Malchiel*—and in a different combination, *Eldaah*, and *Eliphaz* *; whereas there is not a ſingle perſon's name which has any part of *Jehovah* in it, either in its firſt or laſt ſyllable.—*Jochabed*, the mother of Aaron, has, indeed, been alleged as one inſtance to the contrary: "Ex hoc no-"mine (ſays Simonis) colligunt falſum eſſe, quod quidam putant, Moſis demum tempore "nomen *Jehovah* revelatum fuiſſe, ob locum Exod. 6. 3." Onomaſt. p. 517. The inference is raſh, and unwarranted, For, in the firſt place it is not certain that all names beginning with יו are compounded of יהוה and ſome other word: perhaps none of them are ſo compounded. Clearly to entitle *Jochabed* to ſuch an etymology, it ought to be written יהוכבד.—But waving this; and granting that *Jochabed* יוכבד is a compound of יה and כבד, may not this name have been given her by way of honour, even after her death? Or may ſhe not have been ſtill alive at the time of her ſon's miſſion to Egypt, and then received this name† ?—At any rate, this ſingle name, whenceſoever it be derived, or whenſoever it were given, cannot ſtand as a proof that the name *Jehovah* was known priorly to Moſes, againſt ſo poſitive a teſtimony as that of the paſſage in Exodus which gave riſe to this diſcuſſion.

Ver. 9. The addition here in Sam. is ſuppoſed by Grotius, Schulze, and others to be an interpolation from Ch. 14. 12.—But why ſhould it be an interpolation? It is evidently referred to in that very place: "Is not this what we told you in Egypt, ſaying: Let us alone; and let "us ſerve the Egyptians; for it is better for us that we ſerve the Egyptians, &c."—Our Engliſh tranſlators were under the neceſſity of thruſting in theſe words in Italics to make the Text look conſiſtent: "For *it had been* better, &c." It is true, the addition in Ch. 6. 9. is in none of the Antient Verſions; but this only proves at moſt that it was wanting in thoſe Hebrew copies from which the Verſions were made.

Ver. 21. 22. There are two typographical errors in theſe verſes in Blayney's folio edition of 1769, and thence tranſported into Wilſon's Bible: *Zithri* for *Zichri* in ver. 22. and for *Sithri* in ver. 23. But in the firſt edition of James's tranſlation there is only one error: namely *Zithri* for *Sithri* in ver. 23. The Hebrew words are זכרי and סתרי.

* I might add the proper names of places; ſuch as *Bethel*, *Phaniel*. † Amram is ſaid, Exod. 7. 20. to have lived 137 years. Jochabed was probably younger than he, and might live to ſee the deliverance of her people by Moſes and Aaron.

CHAP.

CHAP. VII.

Ver. 1. *I APPOINT thee a God to Pharaoh.* נתתיך אלהים לפרעה. The meaning is "I will "give thee a ſort of godlike power over Pharaoh: but as thou art not eloquent, Aaron ſhall "be thy interpreter, and ſpeak in thy name." Had Aaron then ſtudied the Egyptian language, or did he too employ an interpreter? That Moſes muſt have known the Egyptian perhaps better than his mother-tongue may be inferred from his being brought up at the court of Pharaoh, and educated as the princeſs's ſon: and it may be ſuppoſed, that he underſtood the Hebrew but indifferently, unleſs it were the language ſpoken in the family of Raguel, which is not at all improbable. It might indeed be, that, during a reſidence of upwards of two hundred years in Egypt, the language of that country had become in ſome degree familiar to all the Iſraelites; juſt as during the Babyloniſh captivity they gradually learned and uſed the Chaldee.—But a cloud of darkneſs hangs over all this, which the hiſtorian enables us not to diſpel.

Ver. 5. *The Egyptians ſhall know that I am the Lord.* This ſeems to allude to Pharaoh's ſaying in Ch. 5. 2. "Who is the Lord? I know not the Lord," &c.

We are now come to the famous plagues of Egypt: the prelude to which, in my opinion, warns us to beware of implicit credulity, and greatly weakens the literal credibility of all that follows. The hiſtorian ſays ver. 10. that when "Aaron threw down his rod before Pharaoh, it "became a ſerpent:" but adds; "The Egyptian magicians did in like manner, by their en- "chantments: for when they threw down every one his own rod, *the rods* became ſerpents."

This is certainly a ſtrange narrative, which has greatly puzzled our reconcilers and commentators. Some pretend that it was a mere illuſion on the part of the magicians, but a real miracle on the part of Moſes and Aaron: but they are not agreed as to the ſpecies of illuſion. The Chriſtian Fathers generally imagined, that it was produced by the immediate operation of demons, who blinded the eyes of the byſtanders, and made them ſee phantoms of ſerpents, that had no exiſtence.—Others think that the ſame demons cunningly made the rods diſappear, and put real ſerpents in their places.—Others talk of a real transformation, made by diabolic power, by applying "actives" to "paſſives," *applicando activa paſſivis.* "Poterant dæmones (ſays De "Lyra) materiam proxime diſpoſitam ad formam ſerpentis ſupponere proprio activo, ut ſic "generarentur." This fancy pleaſed Cajetan and Delrio.

Others, who are not willing to allow the demons to have any hand in the matter, are of opinion, that thoſe wonders were effected by the mere uſe of natural means, and by the art of man. Michaëlis ſuppoſes that the rods of the magicians were not real rods, but ſtiff, motionleſs ſerpents, which had the appearance of rods, and which by being thrown on the ground recovered motion. This is certainly an eaſy mode of transformation: and I find ſome German ſcholiaſts ſatisfied with it. But the Text is expreſsly againſt all ſuch interpretations: and we may as well ſay, that the rod of Moſes was not a real rod, as that the rods of the magicians were not real rods.

Hence, ſome have granted, that both the magicians and Moſes wrought real prodigies, but prodigies of a different rank. "God," ſay they, "let the magicians perform a *leſs* miracle, to "enhance the *greater* miracle of Moſes." I can hardly think, that any rational critic will admit this

this hypotheſis; it is making God fight againſt himſelf, and play with miracles as at croſs-purpoſes. He works a leſs miracle, ſufficient to harden the heart of Pharaoh; and a greater, which has no effect in removing that hardneſs: for it is evident that Pharaoh and his courtiers conſidered both as prodigies not above the art of magic; although they might deem Moſes the more expert magician*.

But what, then, are we to ſay of the matter? It would be wiſer, perhaps, although not ſo honeſt, to ſay nothing at all; but that is not my manner: I muſt ſay what I think; let others think and ſpeak as they pleaſe. I am clearly of opinion that neither the magicians of Pharaoh, nor the legiſlator of the Hebrews, changed their rods into ſerpents, any more than the ſorcereſs Circe turned the companions of Ulyſſes into ſwine: but that either the Hebrew hiſtorian, whoever he was, invented the whole ſtory; or that, if ever any ſuch trial of magical ſkill took place, the deception was equal on both ſides.

Ver. 13. *But the rod of Aaron devoured their rods.* This, according to ſome commentators, happened after the rods ceaſed to be ſerpents, and had reſumed their prior form: a rod devouring rods, ſay they, is not at all impoſſible: "virtute divina fieri potuit."—But this is a pure fancy: the word *rod* is here metonymical; and evidently ſtands for *ſerpent*. "Baculus Moſis," ſays Glaſſius, "in ſerpentem verè converſus, vocatur *baculus*, quia talis et antea fuit, et mox "futurus erat."

Ver. 17. *The waters*, &c. *ſhall be turned into blood.* This is the firſt plague: and a dreadful plague it muſt have been; if it ever was inflicted. The water of the Nile is celebrated for its ſuavity and ſalubrity†, both by antient writers and modern travellers. When Berenicé, the daughter of Ptolemy Philadelphus, was married to Antiochus king of Syria, ſhe had water ſent, for her own drinking, all the way from the Nile; and when the ſoldiers of Piſcennius Niger aſked for wine, he replied: "Ye have the Nile, and demand wine:" *Nilum habetis, et vinum quæritis!* Spartian. cap. 7. See alſo Senec. Quæſt. Nat. l. iv. c. 2. Athenæus, l. ii. p. 45. Proſper Alp. De Medicina Ægypt. p. 16. Maillet, Lettres ſur l'Egypte, P. 1. p. 16.

So delicious a beverage changed into blood muſt have been exceedingly ungrateful to the palates of the Egyptians indeed: and we can hardly ſuppoſe a greater calamity to fall on a delicate luxurious people.—But were the waters really converted into blood; or were they only changed into a red blood-like colour? "Impious query!" it will be replied: "doth not "Scripture expreſsly ſay that they were turned into blood?" It doth ſo: but the ſame Scripture had ſaid before, that rods had been turned into ſerpents; and will, by and by, tell us that "the duſt of the earth became gnats:" but we certainly are not obliged to take either the one

* The Hebrew word is חרטם; which, according to Jablonſki, is an Egyptian word, compoſed of AR *to be*, with the aſpiration χ for the article; and of TOMPT *exiſtſy*: but Scholtz plauſibly objects to this derivation, on account of the final τ: and thinks the word is compounded of AR *patrare* and DSHOM *power*, δυναμις; metonymically *a miracle*. The Coptic letter expreſſed by DSH has often the ſound of T; ARDSHOM then with the prefix aſpirate will be CHARTOM; the Hebrew חרטם: which, conſequently ſignifies ὁ πραττων δυναμεις, *patrans miracula, a wonder-worker*. I am much inclined to think that this is the true etymon.—The names of thoſe magicians who oppoſed Moſes were *Jannés* and *Jambrés*, according to St. Paul 2 Tim. 3. 8. But the Orientaliſts call him *Sabur* and *Gadur*; who, we are told, were converted on ſeeing their ſerpents ſwallowed by Aaron's ſerpent; and were on that account put to death by Pharaoh. See D'Herbelot or Calmet. † Hence called by Æſchylus ευπωτον ὑδωρ. Prometh. 811.

or

or the other paſſage in a ſtrictly litteral ſenſe. Accordingly ſome of our beſt modern critics aſſert, that it is not neceſſary to ſuppoſe that the waters were turned into real blood; but that they aſſumed a turbid red appearance, from the particles of red ochre with which they were impregnated*; and which commonly happens at every great exundation of the Nile. So Michaëlis, Schulze, Roſenmüller, Hezel, Dathe: who all place the miracle in this, that the Nile was thus troubled and rubified at an uncommon period: namely in the month of February; whereas the periodical feculency and rubricity of the Nile happen in July and October. "Illud ſanè miraculum fuit (ſays Roſenmüller) quod Nili illa rubido tempore planè inſolito "contigit; nempe in menſe Februario, ex noſtra anni ratione: Nili vero augmentum, cum "quo phænomena illa conjuncta ſunt, Junio demum vel Julio incipit. Simile miraculum foret, "ſi in noſtris regionibus, media æſtate, flumina omnia, rivi, lacus, paludes, aquæ in vaſis, &c. "unius viri juſſu uno die glacie obducerentur: id quod certè miraculum foret, quanquam "glacies ipſa res naturalis et ſolita eſt."—It certainly would be deemed a very uncommon phenomenon, to ſee all our rivers, and lakes, reſervoirs, and ciſterns, frozen over in the middle of June; yet even that would not amount to a miracle; for it might actually happen, and perhaps has happened, by an extraordinary change in the atmoſphere: but if this happened "at "the command of one man" as Roſenmüller expreſſes it, "and inſtantaneouſly at his com-"mand;" I confeſs I ſhould deem it a miraculous event: but then I muſt have the ſtrongeſt proofs poſſible, that ſuch an event took place. Here, I have no proof, no motive of credibility, but the ſole authority of an anonymous Hebrew writer; whom I find everywhere giving into the marvellous, generally clothing his narrative in the garb of poetical imagery, and, according to the oriental cuſtom, aſcribing phyſical events to ſupernatural cauſes.

It is worth remarking that the narrative is here not conſiſtent with itſelf. In ver. 17. Moſes is deſired to ſay to Pharaoh: "With the rod which is in mine hand I will ſtrike the waters that "are in the river, and they ſhall be turned to blood:" and in the diſcharge of this commiſſion, as it has been preſerved in the Samaritan copy, he ſays no more. But in ver. 19. the injunction runs thus: "Say to thy brother Aaron: take thy rod, and ſtretch out thine hand over the "waters of Egypt, over their ſtreams, and over their rivers, and over their lakes, and over all "their ciſterns; that they may become blood, and that there may be blood, throughout all the "land of Egypt, in both *ciſterns* of wood and ſtone."—Yet in ver. 20. Aaron, not Moſes, ſtruck only "the waters that were in the river... and all the waters that were in the river were turned "to blood; and the river ſo ſtunk, that the Egyptians could not drink water out of the river: for it "was blood throughout all the land of Egypt." Which then are we to believe? that the waters only that were in the river were changed to blood; or the whole maſs of waters together, in whatſoever reſervoir they were found? We muſt believe the latter, ſay our commentators; becauſe ſo it is ſaid in ver. 19. and conſequently the Text of ver. 17. and 20. is to be extended to a wider meaning than the words ſeem to admit.—Be it ſo: but if all the water both in and out of the river was actually converted to blood by the outſtretching of the rod of Aaron, where

* This ſtate of a river is well deſcribed by Gavin Douglas, in his Prologue to the 7th Enead:

"Rivers ran *red*, on ſpate, with water broun;
"And burnis harlis all their bankis doun."

found

found the magicians matter to work upon? For they, too, "did in like manner, by their enchantments."—De Lyra gravely tells us, that water was brought to them, by the miniſtry of demons, from ſome other country, "which they can do (ſays he) with wonderful celerity."—Others imagine that a certain quantity of real blood was procured by the ſame infernal agents, and cunningly ſubſtituted in the place of water. "Sanguis latentur allatus eſt a dæmone, et "loco aquæ ſubſtitutus*."—Others are of opinion, that the water was fetched by ordinary means from the land of Goſhen, or from the Mediterranean ſea—But no, ſays Rivet, "it is not "at all probable that the king would patiently wait, until water for his magicians' experiment "ſhould be brought from ſuch a diſtance." He therefore thinks, that either the water was brought to them from the pits dug by the Egyptians about the river†; or that all the waters were not inſtantly, but ſucceſſively, changed into blood; firſt the river by Moſes, and then all the reſt, but not until after the magicians had performed their operation on a part of them. "Aquæ quidem omnes mutatæ ſunt in ſanguinem, ſed ſucceſſivè (neque enim Scriptura dicit hoc "ſimul factum, nec determinat Philo)—primò flumen ſpectante rege; tandem reliqua, poſtquam "hoc tentaſſent magi in rivulo."—This gradual tranſmutation alſo pleaſed Houbigant. "Sic "intelligendum: Magos mutaſſe in ſanguinem eas aquas, ad quas non iverant Moſes et Aaron. "Nimirum, enim, non poterant Moſes et Aaron uno eodemque die, nec duobus vel tribus, ire "ad omnes fluvios, ad omnia ſtagna, ad omnes paludes, canales ligneos et lapideos; neque id "juſſerat Moſi Deus. Juſſerat tantùm ut aquas in ſanguinem verterent in omni terra Egypti. "Neque id *omni* latius patet, quam ut demonſtret, in genere, eas omnes aquas quas Moſes et "Aaron, quocunque irent, reperirent." If ſuch modes of reaſoning pleaſe any reader, I am content. In this, however, I agree with Houbigant, that it is not *neceſſary* to ſuppoſe, with ſome interpreters, that it was not till after the ſeventh day, when the blood was reconverted into water, that the magicians changed them again into blood. "Non jam neceſſe eſt, hanc "ſanguinis plagam iterare, ut, poſtquam dies octo durarit, tum magi aquas, ad ſuam naturam "reverſas, in ſanguinem iterum eaſdem mutarint: neque id ulla poteſt auctoritate firmari." By no authority, indeed! See the Rem. on Ver. 25.—Menochius makes Moſes himſelf very kindly reſerve for the magicians a certain quantity of unconverted water!—I wonder that no one has thought of an immediate creation of water for the purpoſe; or at leaſt of a providential ſhower, howſoever uncommon in Egypt, or howſoever unſeaſonable.—The above will, I think, appear to every reader of ordinary ſenſe, and unbiaſſed by religious prejudice, odd ſpecimens of commentatorſhip. But what was to be done? The prodigy, with all its groſs improbabilities, was to be litterally ſupported; and the moſt ridiculous hypotheſes were invented for that end. Not only the waters of the Nile, in all its various branches and canals, throughout the land of Egypt, but the whole from its moſt remote ſources, with all the influent rivers, muſt have at once been changed into blood! For, if the upper part of the Nile had remained water, it muſt quickly have carried the *blood-water* into the ſea: ſo that not only one tranſmutation was neceſſary, whether it were inſtantaneous or ſucceſſive, but a continued chain of tranſmutations,

* See Pole's Synopſis. † This is as little probable, as that water ſhould be brought from a diſtant place: for the Egyptians would not think of digging pits, until they found that the water of the rivers, lakes, and ciſterns, were undrinkable.

as

as the freſh water rolled down, during the whole duration of the plague; which, if we believe Philo, laſted ſeven days. This is, indeed, an inference not neceſſarily deducible from the Text; as we ſhall preſently ſee: yet ſtill the infection of the river muſt have laſted ſome conſiderable time, ſince the Egyptians were obliged to dig for water around the river, ver. 24.—which, however, according to the ſame Philo and the good St. Auſtin, they did in vain: "Foderunt "Ægyptii, et ſanguinem pro aquis invenerunt." Aug. in Pſalm 77.

Joſephus, on this miracle, ſpeaks with more caution. "By the command of God (ſays he) "the river flowed bloody, αἱματωδης; and adds that it was not only of a bloody *colour*, ουχι την "χροαν δε μονον ην τοιουτος; but gave excruciating pains to thoſe who would drink of it*," This comes nearly to the opinion of Michaëlis, Dathe, Roſenmüller, and Hezel, whoſe entire note on this place I will preſent to my learned readers, in his own words: "Natürlicher weiſe iſt "hier nicht wirkliches blut das in thieriſchen körpern flieſst, ſondern nur die rothe farbe zu "verſtehen, welche das waſſer auf einmal annehmen ſoll. Die Hebräer nennen die rothe farbe "öfters geradezu blut. Daher heiſst der *rothe wein*, Gen. 49. 11. Deut. 32. 14. *trauben-blut*. "Und Joel 3. 4. heiſst es, der mond ſolle in *blut* verwandelt werden; d. i. ſich blutroth färben. "—Das waſſer des Nils wird, nach Pococks und anderer zuverläſſigen reiſebeſchreiber bericht, "alle jahre einmal, und zwar zu anfang des Junius, roth, welches von der rothen erde kommt, "die aus den quellen des Nils geſchwemmt wird, wenn ſie ſich ſtärker zu ergieſſen anfangen. "Daſs, alſo, das waſſer ein blut wurde, oder roth ward, war, an und für ſich betrachtet, natür-"lich, und kein wunder. Gleichwohl aber wird es von Pharao und den übrigen Ægyptiern für "etwas auſſerordentliches angeſehen. Und dies auſſerordentliche and wirklich wunderbare muſs "darinn beſtanden haben, daſs ſich das Nil-waſſer zu einer ganz ungewöhnlichen zeit, ohne "zweifel viel früher als ſonſt gewöhnlich, und auf ganz auſſerordentliche art, recht hochroth "färbte, und—welches die hauptſache war—daſs Moſes (welches er, als menſch, ohne göttliche "offenbarung nicht wiſſen konnte) dieſe färbung des Nil-waſſers vorherſagte, und genau beſtimm-"te wenn es geſchehen ſollte. Dies war wunder! dies Gottes finger! nicht menſchenſache!"—According to theſe interpreters, the miracle conſiſted not in turning the waters into blood, or making them of a bloody colour, which they have once every year in the month of June, when the Nile exundates; but in producing this phenomenon at an unuſual ſeaſon, and its being foreſeen and foretold by Moſes. This is, at leaſt, ſomething like rational criticiſm. But ſtill to me it appears to labour under great difficulties. For what other proof have we that Moſes foretold, or foreſaw, that the waters were, I ſhall not ſay, to be turned into blood, but into a blood-red colour at a ſeaſon when that phenomenon never, or rarely, happened; than the bare word of an hiſtorian whoſe teſtimony ſeems to carry along with it ſtrong marks of his credulity; and who relates his ſtory with ſuch concomitant circumſtances, as render the whole, in my eſtimation, highly incredible?—With reſpect to the uncommon ſeaſon in which the waters of the Nile are ſuppoſed to have been *changed into blood*, according to the Text, or deeply *tinged with red ochre*, according to ſome interpreters, I have two things to ſay. Firſt, How is it known that this exundation of the Nile happened at an uncommon ſeaſon? We are told indeed that the Iſraelites went out of Egypt in the ſpring of our year: and that the firſt *Phaſah*, pre-

* Antiq. l. ii. c. 14. §. 1.

viouſly to their departure, was kept on the *tenth of Niſan:* but we are not told in what month, or on what day, the plagues were begun to be inflicted. We learn indeed from Ch. 9. 31. that the plague of hail happened at a time when "the barley was in the ear, and the flax bolling." This muſt have been ſome time in the month of February, in which, ſays Forſkal, an eye-witneſs, the barley in Egypt is ripe:—"hordeum cum menſe Februario maturatur." But as the barley is not here ſaid to have been *ripe*, but only "*in the ear*;" we may ſuppoſe that the hail fell about the middle of February; which leaves an interval of nearly two months between the plague of the hail and the laſt plague of mortality; even if the firſt new-moon of April, that year, happened on the very firſt day of the month Niſan. But the firſt new-moon might have happened many days later, nay almoſt a whole month later; and, in that caſe, the *tenth of Niſan* would be far in *May:* ſo that an interval would be given, ſuppoſe from the 10th of February to the tenth of May; or three full months. Now, if the infliction of only two plagues took up the ſpace of three months, may we not allow eight months at leaſt for the infliction of the reſt*? and this will bring us back to the preciſe time of the annual exundation of the Nile. On the whole then, the pretended change of the waters of the Nile into blood may, for aught we know, have happened at the very time of their perturbed ſtate in the beginning of June: although perhaps in that year the exundation may have been greater, and the waters more highly tinged than uſual†: which, whether miraculous or not, might alarm the ſuperſtitious people, and be by Moſes artfully employed as a motive to obtain the liberation of the Iſraelites.

Or, ſecondly, allowing that this was in reality an extraordinary exundation of the Nile, out of its ordinary ſeaſon, it would not thence follow that it was a miracle properly ſo called. An uncommon rain in Upper Egypt would produce that effect: and although ſuch rains are rare, we find that they ſometimes happen. "When we were at Furſhout‡ (ſays Mr. Bruce) there "happened a very extraordinary phenomenon. It rained the whole night, and till about nine "o'clock next morning: and the people began to be very apprehenſive leſt the whole town "ſhould be deſtroyed. It is a perfect *prodigy* to ſee rain here; and the prophets‖ ſaid it por-"tended a diſſolution of government." Vol. i. p. 116.

To either of theſe hypotheſes commentators are welcome—nay, they are welcome to make as great a miracle as they pleaſe of the phenomenon: but unleſs they do violence to their text, they muſt allow that the magicians did a miracle alſo; a petty miracle indeed, compared with that of Moſes: but ſtill a miracle—for

Ver. 22. *The Egyptian magicians did in like manner, by their enchantments.* I know, our commentators tell us, that it was all a trick on the part of the magicians. The rogues had got by them a little red earth, from the ſources of the Nile, which they ſecretly thruſt into a ſmall

* No period of time is marked between the infliction of one plague and another; except with regard to the Frogs; and all that we are told there is, that ſeven days had paſſed ſince the infection of the river, when the Lord ſent Moſes to Pharaoh to announce another plague: but it is not ſaid that this plague was immediately inflicted: nor is the interval between any two plagues directly noted. † If a rain happened at the ſame time on the porphyry and marble mountains between the Nile and the Red Sea; the purple and red ſand with which theſe mountains are covered would be waſhed down in great quantities, and run in torrents to the great river. See Bruce, vol. i. p. 186, 187.

‡ Between Tentyra and Thebes, about the 26th degree of latitude. ‖ Theſe prophets no doubt conſidered it as a miracle.

quantity

quantity of water*, in a cup or baſon; and made Pharaoh and the other ſpectators believe it to be blood. That they believed it to be as much blood, as that produced by Moſes and Aaron, is clear from the context; for "the heart of Pharaoh was ſtill ſo hardened that he would not "hearken to them." More conſiſtent, then, are thoſe interpreters who allow that the magicians turned water into blood, as well as Moſes. "In ſome of the pools or lakes of water (ſay they) "which Moſes had not yet turned into blood; or in ſome of the waters out of the pits, which "the people digged; (ver. 24.) *they effected the like change*. God, by permitting theſe deluded "men thus far to *ſucceed* in their oppoſition, took occaſion to render their impiouſ folly more "conſpicuous; ſince, by permitting them *to change the waters into blood*, and putting it out of "their power to reſtore them to their former ſoundneſs†, and by permitting them to produce "frogs, which they were not able to remove, they only increaſed thoſe plagues upon themſelves "and their countrymen." See Patrick's Comment. and James on the Pentateuch.—Enough of blood: let us proceed to the ſecond plague.

CHAP. VIII.

IN ſome Hebrew copies this chapter begins only at ver. 5.

Ver. 1. *Frogs*. צפרדעים. There is no diſagreement about the meaning of the word‡, but its etymology is very uncertain. Lexicographers commonly derive from צפר, which in Chald. ſignifies the *morning*, and דע *knowledge*; becauſe, ſay they, the frogs by croaking give warning that the morning is come. Poor Chanticleer! to have thy privilege uſurped by a naſty frog! —But, no: frogs croak not in the morning but in the evening, and in the dark, when they come out of their watery reſidence to indulge their amours and *coax* their mates‖.

Parkhurſt takes the word to be a compound of צפר "denoting *the briſk action or motion of* "*light*; and ידע *to feel*, becauſe theſe animals are in an eminent manner affected by it. They "uſually croak only in the *ſummer* months, and hide themſelves when winter approaches. "The above derivation (continues he) is not a little confirmed by two of the Chaldee names of "this animal, אורדע and אורדען, plainly compounded in like manner of אור *light* and ידע *to feel*." This etymon is falſe in ſeveral reſpects: for, Firſt, a meaning is given to צפר which it has not either in Hebrew or any kindred dialect. Secondly, were it granted that צפר ſignifies *light*, and metaphorically *ſummer*, it could not form a compound with ידע, in the form of צפרדע, to denote

* Others will have it, that they coloured the water with a rod dipped in ſome reddiſh matter; "baculo intincto "materiæ rubricanti," ſays Roſenmüller. † We read not when, or how, the waters were *reſtored to their former ſoundneſs*: and here the hiſtorian ſeems to have overlooked a material point. Another miracle was to have been expected to reconvert the blood into water; at leaſt what was in the lakes and ciſterns: for we may ſuppoſe that what was in the river and its branches would be carried, in the courſe of ſeven days, into the ſea. What a pity it was not the Red Sea! for then we ſhould have an excellent reaſon for its being ſo called. See Rem. on Ch. 14. 18.

‡ Aben Ezrah, indeed, ſays that ſeveral Rabbis thought it was *the crocodile*; and Aberbanel himſelf deemed this opinion very probable. The proofs which he has adduced in ſupport of it, had ſo great a weight with D. Levi, that he is firmly perſuaded that it is the right one. But Aben-Ezrah and Jarhi think differently: and there are few modern critics, I believe, who think not as they do. ‖ "Porro, clamor veſpertinus quem Græci ολολυγονες, Latini *coaxationem* "appellant, illis eſt pro incentivo et amatorio carmine; ut pluribus ſcribunt Ælianus et Plutarchus." Bochart. Hieroz. l. v. c. 1.

the feeler of light, or as we might ſay, *light-feeler*. Hebrew words are not ſo compounded: it would be ידעצפר. Thirdly, twenty other animals feel the genial warmth of ſummer as much or more than the frog, and are as much afraid of the nipping cold of winter. Mr. Parkhurſt's corroboration from the Chaldee is founded on miſconception. The word is not אורדע nor אורדען, but עורדען, which is nothing elſe than the Hebrew term according to the Chaldee orthography, which frequently converts a *tzadé* into an *aïn*, and a *phé* into a *vau*. It is true, the Syriac verſion has אורדעא, and the Sam. verſion ארדעה; but this is an uſual commutation of *aïn* into *aleph*: ſo that the word is originally ſtill the ſame. The Arabic of Saadias צְפאדע is evidently a contraction of צפרדע, with the inſertion of *eliph* and the change of *tzadé* into *dad*.

Let us next ſee Bochart's derivation, which ſeems now to be generally received. He will have it to be compounded of the Arabic צְפָּה *a bank* and רדע *ſlime*: ſo that the Hebrew צפרדע, according to him, denotes *an animal reſiding at the ſlimy banks of rivers or marſhes*: "ad limoſas "amnium aut paludum ripas degens."—With all due deference to the great Bochart, I will now venture my own conjecture. I think then that the word is derived from the Hebrew root צפף *pipire, muſſitare, ululare*, and the Arabic רדע *ſlime, mud*: as if we were to call *the frog* the *ſlime-croaker*: ſurely no inappropriate appellation.—So much for etymology—Now again to the Text.

The plague of *frogs** ſeems to have been a natural conſequence of the overflow of perturbed ſlimy water. It is well known that the Nile is extremely fertile of theſe more nauſeous and troubleſome than hurtful animals: and if many of them were not annually deſtroyed by ſtorks and ſerpents, they would multiply prodigiouſly. The miracle, therefore, according to our demi-miraculiſt commentators, conſiſted not merely in the multiplicity of frogs: but in their covering the whole land of Egypt in one day at the command of Moſes; and their being afterwards at once deſtroyed by the ſame power. Be it ſo: ſtill we are told ver. 7. that "in like "manner, alſo, did the Egyptian magicians, by their enchantments, bring up frogs upon the land of Egypt."—They could not however remove them: this was reſerved for Moſes.

Ver. 9. *Deal honourably with me.* התפאר עלי, which in our public verſion is rendered "Glory "over me;—" by Coverdale "Have thou the honour before me." In Cranmer's Bible, "Rejoice "thou over me." In the Biſhops Bible, "Glory herein becauſe of me." By Purver, "Honour "thyſelf above me."—All more or leſs from Pagninus's "*Gloriare ſuper me*†."—Very differently

* The plague of frogs is not peculiar to Egypt: Caſſander, ab Apollonia rediens, incidit in Abderitas qui, propter "*ranarum muriumque* multitudinem relicto patrio ſolo, ſedes quærebant." Juſtin. lib. xv. c. 2. See alſo Pliny, Hiſt. Nat. Hier. part i. viii. 29. But the moſt ſingular example is that recorded by Phœnias, as quoted by Euſtathius (apud Bochartum, Pars ii. l. i. c. 2.) namely, that God rained ſuch a quantity of frogs upon Pœonia and Dardania that the roads were full of them; that they entered the houſes and veſſels; corrupted the waters and victuals; and were ſo thick upon the ground, that no one could tread on it without touching them; and that their ſtench was ſo intolerable that the inhabitants are ſaid to have fled from the country. "Et Phœnias quidem ſcripſit ὑσαι τον Θεον βατραχους περι Παιονιαν και Δαρδανιαν, "ὡν και τοσουτον ην πληθος, ὡς τας οδους πληρουσαι· ὡς δε κτεινοντες, και συγκλειοντες τας οικιας, ουδεν ηνυον· αλλα "και τα σκευη επληρουντο, και μετα των εδεσματων ησαν οἱ βατραχοι συνεπομενοι· και ουδε τοις ὑδασι ην χρησθαι, ουδε "τους ποδας επι γην θειναι, ὁια συσσεσωρευμενων αυτων· αχλουντο δε και ὑπο της των τετελευτηκοτων οσμης, εφυγον, "φασι, την χωραν." See more in Bochart, loc. cit. † And ſo moſt modern tranſlators, Latin, Italian, French, Spaniſh, Dutch, and the German of Luther. Yet what ſenſe can be annexed to ſuch a tranſlation, it is not eaſy to perceive.

moſt

moſt of the antients. Sep. ταξαι προς με, "appoint to me." So Vulg. *Conſtitue mihi.* Onk. שאל לך גבורה.—Syr. שאל לך זבנא, *aſk to thyſelf a time.* It is equivalent to Sep. and Vulg.—To the ſame purport Saadias, אקתרח עלי.—It has been ſuppoſed that they all had in their copies התבאר* the *hithphael* of באר, inſtead of התפאר the *hithphael* of פאר: and indeed there is no doubt of the letters *phé* and *beth* having been frequently interchanged. Yet here there is no variety of lection in either the Sam. or Heb. copies; and three of the antient tranſlators at leaſt read as we now do, namely Pſeudo-Jonathan, Perſ. and Arab. Erp. The Gr. of Venice has likewiſe, καλλωπισθητι επ' εμοι. I am perſuaded that התפאר is the genuine reading, and that its meaning is *to act honourably*, or *deal fairly*. Indeed I take the Hebrew פאר and our Engliſh *fair* to be the ſelf-ſame radical word; denoting *beauty, goodlineſs, glory*, &c. So that the words התפאר עלי are equivalent to *Deal fairly, beautifully, honourably, with me*;—as we might ſay of one who has done an honourable action, *it was beautifully done in him.* Every language has ſimilar catechreſes†.

Ver. 11. "*In the river only ſhall they remain.*" That is, thoſe who were yet in the river remained there: for the ſwarms which had over-run the land only "died away from the houſes," &c. and were gathered together by the people "in heaps, ſo that the land ſtank *with them*," ver. 14—a plague more nauſeous than even that which preceded. If Moſes had acted honourably with Pharaoh, he ought to have made the frogs creep back to their watery retreats as faſt as they came: for to kill them only and leave them to ſtink on the land was doing things but by halves: ſo that the whole miracle here, if miracle there were, conſiſted in not letting more frogs come out of the river, ſtreams, and lakes, to annoy the Egyptians.—Howſoever,

Ver. 15. *When Pharaoh ſaw that there was reſpite,* הרוחה‡, he *ſtill* hardened "his heart;" and conſequently muſt not have believed, that there was any thing ſupernatural in the preceding prodigies.—We now come to the *Third* plague; namely

Ver. 17. "The duſt of the earth," ſtruck by Aaron's rod, "becoming gnats, throughout all "the land of Egypt."—The word which I render *gnats* is כנים, which Joſephus, the Jewiſh Rabbis, and moſt modern tranſlators render *lice:* and Bochart and Bryant have laboured hard to ſupport this interpretation‖. They ought not, however, to have ſo confidently appealed to the Syr. and Chald. Verſions, as being in their favour: for קלמא, or קלמתא, which are the words they uſe, are without ſufficient authority tranſlated *pediculus* in the Polyglott§ and by Buxtorf. —From Bar-Bahlul, the prince of Syrian lexicographers, we learn that the Syr. קלמא is an animalcule hurtful to the eye-brows, *animalcula palpebris inimica*¶. Nor is it to be doubted, that the Chaldee, being the ſame word, has the ſame meaning**. So Walton: "Beſtiola eſt exigua, "lædens cutem, penetrans per nares, aures, itemque oculos. Non igitur *pediculus*, illis partibus "vix, aut ne vix infenſus unquam."—Philo, who muſt have been well acquainted with the inſects of Egypt, deſcribes it nearly in the ſame manner; "A very ſmall but moſt troubleſome "animal, which hurts not only the ſurface of the ſkin, but forces its way inwardly by the

* Houbigant corrects thus: אתה באר עלי, *tu declara mihi.* † So the Greeks, το καλον εργον—the Latins, *pulchrum facinus*—the Italians, *una bella cena*—the French, *une belle action*—and we, *a beautiful voice.* ‡ Sep. αναψυξις. Vulg. *requies.* Gr. Ven. αναχωχη. ‖ Bochart. Hieroz. p. ii. l. 4. c. 18.—Bryant's *Plagues of Egypt.* p. 56, et ſeq. § That is by the tranſlator of Syr. and Tharg.; for Onkelos's tranſlator renders קלמתא by *ciniphes.* ¶ Apud Walton. ** The Sam. קלמים belongs to the ſame claſs.

"noſtrils

"noſtrils and ears; and even inſinuates itſelf into the pupils of the eyes, if one be not very "heedful*."—Indeed the authority of the Septuagint alone is to me a ſtronger proof that not *lice*, but *gnats*, σκνιφες, is the genuine meaning of כנים, than that of all the rabbinical commentators together, with Joſephus at their head; and with the collateral aid of both Arabs, Perſ. and Gr. Ven.: although the Arabs are at beſt but dubious evidence† on the queſtion.—Nor of ſmall avail is the teſtimony of Jerom who, both here and in the Pſalms, follows the Septuagint; and renders כנים *ſciniphes*, or *cinifes*; which he would hardly have done, if his Hebrew maſters, to whom he ſometimes gave too much credit, had told him that the word had a different meaning.

So much for the meaning of כנים‡; now for its etymology. Some will have it to be an Egyptian word: but this I think is improbable, as in that caſe we ſhould probably find σκνιφες rendered by it in the Coptic verſion; which however has a very different word, *leblem*. Others derive it from כן, alluding, ſay they, to the *ſteadineſs* with which *lice* adhere to the human body; or to the *firm-ſettling* of the *gnats* or *moſquitos* on the bodies of men or animals. Others make כן the root, and quote Iſaiah 51. 6. כמו כן ימותן, which in our common Engliſh verſion is rendered "they ſhall die *in like manner*||;" but which, according to thoſe interpreters, ſhould be *like a louſe*. If כן here be the ſingular§ of כנים, it would greatly confirm the verſion of Sep. in Exod.; for the ephemerical life of any ſpecies of *gnats* would be a fitter image of the tranſitorineſs of human life, than the very uncertain duration of the life of a *louſe:* beſides that the figure would be leſs ignoble, and more congruous to the dignity of the ſubject.—Michaëlis is rather inclined to conſider the final ם in כנים as radical, and that the *jod* is an interloper; eſpecially as the word is thrice written without it, and twice pointed כִּנָּם with a *kametz*; and is beſides in ver. 17. in concord with a ſingular verb תדו and דוה. This laſt argument is cer-

* Το δε ζωον, ει και βραχυτατον ὁμως αργαλεωτατον· ου γαρ μονον την επιφανειαν λυμαινεται, κνησμους εμποιουν αηδεις και βλαβερωτατους, αλλα και εις τα εντον βιαζεται δια μυκτηρων και ωτων· σινεται δε και κορας οφθαλμων εισπετομενον, ει μη φυλαξαιτο τις. De vita Moſis, l. i. p. ii. p. 97. ed. Mangey.—The deſcription given by Origen, who alſo reſided in Egypt, is to the ſame purport. "Hoc animal pennis quidem ſuſpenditur per aëra volitans, ſed ita ſubtile eſt et immi- "nutum, ut oculi viſum, niſi acutè cernentis, effugiat: corpus tamen cum inſederit, acerrimo terebrat ſtimulo, ita ut "quem volitantem videre quis non valeat, ſentiat ſtimulantem." Hom. iv. in Exod. ex Interp. Rufini. tom. ii. p. 142. ed. Bened. † The Arabic word is קמל, too generical a term to reſtrict the meaning to *lice*; as it denotes ſeveral other animalcules of the inſect kind; as the curious reader may ſee by turning to Golius or to Caſtell. Certain it is that by the Arabic tranſlator of the Pſalms, who made his verſion from the Greek, the ſame word is uſed to expreſs σκινιφες: ſo that, on the whole, only two verſions, namely Perſ. and Gr. Ven. are decidedly for *lice:* the former having שִׁבְשׁ, the latter φθειρες. ‡ Bochart's objections are well anſwered by Michaelis; to whoſe *Supplementa* I refer my reader; and alſo to Oedmann's excellent *Vermiſchte Sammlungen aus der Naturkunde zur Erklärung der Heil. Schrift.* part i. ch. 6. His book was originally written in Swediſh, but tranſlated into German by Gröning; and printed at Leipſic in 1786. A good account of it may be found in Michaelis's *New Oriental Library*, part iii. p. 20, &c.
|| And ſo indeed all the antient verſions. See the Rem. on that place. § "Singularem recentiorum multi "faciunt, a quo plurale כנים, ut putant, ortum: quod quidem mihi ſuſpectum eſſe jam ſupra profeſſus ſum. Sed fac "verum eſſe, vel huic loco aptiores *culices*, quam *pediculi* erunt: hos quidem, turpe animal atque in magnifico carmine "indecorum ac prope nefas nominatu, mortales quidem agnoſco, ſed mori non videmus, niſi vi necentur; ut vel, quam "diu vivant, ignoremus; perennare et in dies augeſcere ſentiunt ii quibus hærent: at *culices* annum vivendo non ſuperant, "ſed ſtato anni tempore emoriuntur et intereunt; multo melior brevitatis vitæ humanæ nec turpis imago." Michaëlis Supplem. ad Lex. Hebr.

tainly

tainly not cogent. Such an enallage is not unfrequent, particularly in the ſubſtantive verb. It occurs in the very firſt ch. of Geneſis, יהי מאורות without any diverſity of reading even in the Sam. copies.—On the whole I am inclined to believe that the כן of Iſaiah is the ſingular of כנים, and that כנם is a blunder of the Hebrew copyiſts: for in the Sam. exemplars the word is uniformly written full: which, although of little authority in the eyes of Michaëlis, is of great weight in mine: as will be more fully ſhewn in my Diſſertation on the Sam. Pentateuch.

For the reſt, it is allowed that Egypt ever was, and ſtill is, annually infeſted with moſquito gnats*. Therefore, ſay our commentators, the miracle here conſiſted in bringing them at an unuſual time, namely in the month of February, which in Egypt is the coldeſt month of the year†; whereas the gnats chiefly abound at the exundation of the Nile.—But whence is it known that this happened in the month of February? I believe it happened a ſhort time after the plague of frogs, in the month of July or Auguſt: and I have no doubt it will be found, that at that ſeaſon the moſquitos are extremely abundant in Egypt.

Ver. 18. *In like manner did the magicians try*, &c. The original has ויעשו כן, *and ſo did they*, but the verb עשה ſometimes ſignifies the *attempting to do* a thing. Here, according to our hiſtorian, the attempt was vain: the magicians could not produce gnats; and therefore ſaid to Pharaoh: "The finger of a God is this;" אצבע אלהים הוא. The *finger* of God is his *power*; and is uſed in the ſame ſenſe in the New Teſtament, Luke 11. 20.—Still "Pharaoh har-"dened his heart:" and hard indeed it muſt have been, beyond all credibility, if he were convinced, even by this pretended declaration of his magicians, that there was any thing miraculous in all that had yet been done. I ſay *pretended declaration*; for we have no other proof that the magicians confeſſed their inferiority, than the bare word of an unknown Hebrew writer; whoſe authority may ſurely be queſtioned, as well as that of any other hiſtorian, unleſs we make a ſacrifice of our reaſon to implicit faith; and believe ſtupendous miracles without adequate motives of credibility.—In the infliction of the remaining plagues, Moſes has the whole field to himſelf: the magicians are mere ſpectators.

Ver. 21. *A ſwarm of beetles.* את הערב, which in our public Verſion is rendered "ſwarms *of flies*;" and in the margin, "a mixture *of noiſome beaſts*." This laſt is borrowed from Joſephus and the Bab. Thargum; and, indeed, almoſt all the antient verſions, except the Septuagint, lean that way.—Aquila: παμμιαν.—Vulg. *omne genus muſcarum.*—Syr. ערובא כלגנס, *mixturam omnis generis.* Both Arabs: ח֗לט אלוחש, *mixtura ferarum.* To the ſame purport the Thargums: Onkelos, Perſ. and Gr. Ven. have only words denoting *mixture*, ית ערובא, ערב‡, συγχυσιν. In this meaning it was taken by the Rabbinical interpreters; who by way of improvement add, that the *mixture* contained all ſorts of noxious animals, ſerpents, ſcorpions, &c. Delgado is contented with *a mixture of vermin.* Purver: *a mixture of noiſome creatures.* Bate: *a raven!*

That it was one particular inſect, and not a mixture of different animals, ſeems pretty clear even from the context: but it is not quite certain what particular inſect it was. Some have

* See Herodot. l. ii. c. 95. Bellonius, l. ii. c. 35. Haſſelquiſt. † "Quum iſta inſecta Ægyptios, tum "olim, tum nunc, quotannis infeſtare ſoleant etiam nullo miraculo; veriſimile eſt, illa *modo aliquo inſolito* immiſſa eſſe, "quo quiſque intelligere potuit, contigiſſe hanc plagam juſſu Dei extraordinario." Roſenmüller in locum.
‡ It is the Hebrew word.

imagined

imagined it to be the gad-bee, *tabanus*, from the deſcription given by Philo, who ſays it is called κυνομυια from its *dog-like* impudence. "The impoſers of names (ſays he), who were wiſe "men, gave this inſect an appellation from the qualities of two moſt impudent animals, a *dog* "and a *fly*. For this ſpecies of fly attacks with fearleſs fury, and will not be driven away or "quit its hold, until it be ſatiated with blood and fleſh *." This is evidently a deſcription of the gad-bee; but no proof that the ערוב of Exodus was that inſect. Philo, who was ignorant of Hebrew, only gives a deſcription of the κυνομυια of the Septuagint. But there are two or three circumſtances which militate againſt this interpretation. 1. The ערוב is ſaid to have been ſent, not upon the beſtial, but upon the human kind. 2. They enter the houſes. 3. The very ground is filled with them. All theſe circumſtances are againſt the *gad-bee*, but perfectly ſuit the *beetle*. It is then highly probable that the little animal in queſtion is the *blatta Egyptiaca*, or *Egyptian beetle*; which Forſkal found frequent in the houſes of Alexandria; and which, having jaws and teeth, is a moſt voracious creature; that not only bites the human race, but alſo devours cloaths, books, plants; whatever comes in its way. Hence the Pſalmiſt 78. 7. "He ſent on them beetles, ערוב, which devoured them."

As to the etymon of the Hebrew word, ſome derive it from the Arabic ערב *to conſume:* but, in that caſe, I think, it ſhould be written עורב —I would, therefore, rather derive it from עֵרֶב *dark-coloured, black*; from which alſo, I believe, the Hebrew עֶרֶב *evening* takes its origin. For the ſame reaſon the *raven* is called ערב. See on the ſubject Oedmann's *Miſcellanies*, already quoted, and Michaëlis's *Supplementa*.

Ver. 22. *In the midſt of the land.* בקרב הארץ. The ſentence is ambiguous. The Lord's *being in the land* may mean, either that he is in the midſt of *Egypt*, to afflict its inhabitants, or in the midſt of the land of *Goſhen*, to favour his own people. In this latter ſuppoſition the proper rendering would be "in the midſt of that land:" and in this ſenſe it is taken by Houbigant and Roſenmüller.

Ver. 23. *And make a diſtinction.* The Hebrew word, פדות, commonly ſignifies *redemption*; and ſo it is here rendered by Onk. and Tharg. and equivalently by both Arabs, Perſ. and Gr. Ven. But Sep. Syr. and Vulg. have words denoting *diſtinction*, διαχολην—פורשנא—*diviſionem:* and this or ſome ſuch term the context ſeems to require. But how can פדות or פדת be wreſted into ſuch a meaning? Houbigant finds it in the Arab. פד, *ſolus, ſingularis*. God made a *ſingularity* between his people and the Egyptians. The ſame origin had occurred to myſelf before I read Houbigant: but I cannot ſay, that it altogether pleaſes me. More ingenious is the conjecture of the author of *Commentaries and Eſſays*; who thinks the original reading was פלות from פלה. "The miſtake," ſays he, "of ד for ל is eaſy; eſpecially, ſuppoſing the ל to be a little "maimed at the top; and the verb פלה is the only verb uſed to expreſs the ſame thing, through "the whole of this tranſaction, as Ch. x. 4. and xi. 7. In the very verſe preceding the paſſage "in queſtion, we have והפליתי *I will ſever*, or *divide*.—So here: I will put a diviſion." The greateſt objection to this is, that the Samaritan copies have likewiſe פדות, with a ד; and it is

* Ετυμως εκαλουν οι θετικοι των ονοματων (σοφοι γαρ ησαν) εκ των αναιδεςατων ζωων συνθεντες τ'ουνομα, μυιας και κυνος· επιφοιτουσι γαρ και επιτρεχουσιν αδεως· κ'αν ανειργῃ τις εις το αηττητον αντιφιλονικουσιν, αχρις αν αἱματος και σαρκων κορεσθωσιν. De Vit. Moſ. t. ii. p. 101. ed. Mangey.

hardly

hardly poſſible that, in the Sam. characters, a *lamed* ſhould be miſtaken for a *daleth*: ſo if any ſuch change took place, it muſt have been an error of the *ear*, and not of the *eye*. Certain it is that *L* and *D* have frequently changed places in other languages. Thus from the Greek δακρυμα came the Latin *lacryma*, written ſometimes *dacryma*:—from μελεταω, *meditari*. And, in Latin itſelf, *ſella* was originally written *ſedda*; *olefacio*, *odefacio*; and *calamitas*, *cadamitas*. But whether in the Hebrew and its ſiſter-dialects ſuch commutations ever were uſual, I would not raſhly aſſert. The example from Gen. 6. 3. adduced by Calmet, who thinks that ידן might have originally been ילן, is not well warranted. Perhaps the word here in queſtion was originally פרדות or פרדת; and the ר was either accidentally dropt, or induſtriouſly elided for the ſake of euphony.

Ver. 29. *Lo! I now go out*, &c. הנה אנכי יוצא, *En ego exiens*. But Sam. has אצא *exibo*, and ſo ſeem to have read Sep. and Gr. Ven. εξελευσομαι—εξειμι. But the other verſions read in the participle, which is perhaps more idiomatical: and indeed nine Sam. MSS. have יצא, without the *vau*. A ſtrange blunder is here obſervable in Sep. Rom. and Alex. ὁ δε for ιδου, which latter is the reading of Canonici's MS. and, I doubt not, of many others. Complut. has ιδε, equivalent to ιδου, but Ald. has ωδε. That ιδου, or ιδε, is the genuine reading, is certain; as has been well remarked by Scharfenberg.—The reader will pleaſe to notice that in our common editions of the Hebrew Text this chapter begins at v. 5. of our Engliſh diviſion; which however is that of Sam. and followed by Plantin in his editions, and by Walton in the Polyglott. It is indeed of little importance, although the latter is evidently the more natural diviſion.

CHAP. IX.

Ver. 3. *THE hand of the Lord ſhall be on thy cattle.* That is, a great mortality ſhall happen among them. When in v. 6. they are *all* ſaid to have died, we muſt underſtand it of a great number; as we find *cattle* ſtill alive v. 19. or, rather, that this plague affected every ſpecies of cattle. Hence Dathe not improperly renders: *Lues ſæviit per omnes Ægyptiorum greges*. Michaëlis: "Unter alle heerden der Aegyptier kam ein ſterben."

Ver. 8. *Furnace-aſhes.* פיח כבשן. Sep. αιθαλης καμινοιαις. Vulg. *cineris de camino*. Onk. פיח דאתונא. Syr. קטמא דאתונא. Both Arabs מן פיח אלאתון. Perſ. דודי דאשׁ. Gr. Ven. φυσημα καμινου: all which, ſave Vulg. denote rather ſmoke than aſhes: and indeed the Hebrew word, which occurs only here, is derived from a root favourable to that meaning. But how, it will be ſaid, could Moſes and Aaron fill their hands with ſmoke? The anſwer is eaſy—a denſe cloud of ſmoke ariſing from a furnace carries off with it a quantity of very ſmall aſhes, which may without much exaggeration be termed a part of the ſmoke itſelf. It was with theſe minute cinereal particles, that Moſes and Aaron filled their hands: which the Thargum not badly expreſſes by דקיק. It is to be remarked that the Hebrew word, which we render *furnace*, deſignates not an *oven-furnace*, but a *brick-kiln*, or any other ſuch furnace.

Ver. 9. *An ulcerous inflammation.* שחין פרח אבעבעות, rendered by our laſt Engliſh tranſlators "a boil breaking forth *with* blains." Sep. ἑλκη φλυκτιδες αναξουσαι *. Vulg. *ulcera et*

* Aquila: πεταζομεναι—Sym. εξανθουσαι.

veſicæ turgentes; and in the next verſe, *ulcera veſicarum turgentium*. Onk. אבעבועין * שחין סגי. Syr. שוחנא דנופחא דסני. Saad. קרחא נאבתא מתנפטא. Arab. Erp. קרחא נאבתא נפאפט. Perſ. אבלהי שכפתה כפדא †. Gr. Ven. ἑλκος ωνθουν πομφολυγγας ‡.—All agree in making the plague an ulcerous ſore, producing a number of blains or bliſters: and from the radical meaning of שחן we may infer that it was an inflammatory ulcer; or, as I have rendered it, "an ul-"cerous inflammation." It is literally and well rendered, by Le Clerc and Roſenmüller, *inflammatio puſtulas emittens*. It is, in Deut. 28. 27. emphatically called "the ulcer of Egypt;" and is now generally ſuppoſed to be that ſpecies of leproſy called *elephantiaſis*. See Schilling *De Lepra*, or Michaëlis's *Supplem. ad Lex. Hebr.*

Ver. 15. In our common verſion this verſe is thus rendered: "For now I will ſtretch out "my hand, that I may ſmite thee and thy people with peſtilence; and thou ſhalt be cut off "from the earth." Nor was this tranſlation mended by Bate. It was thus rectified by Purver: "For now I might have ſtretched out my hand, &c." but ſtill better by Delgado: "For I could now ſtretch forth my hand, &c." agreeably to my verſion, and that of moſt modern tranſlators. Dathe: *Et jam nunc te, pro potentia mea, tuumque populum ex hac terra peſte auferre poſſem*. Roſenmüller: *Extendere poſſem manum meam, et percutere poſſem te*, &c. Hezel: "Ich könnte zwar meine hand ausrecken, &c." Le Clerc and Houbigant had preceded them: Exererem, *ſi vellem*, manum."—"Quod ſi nunc mitterem manum." Of the antients, Onk. Jonathan and Saadias underſtood their text in the ſame manner; although their dialects had not, any more than the Hebrew, a potential mood to expreſs the meaning.

Ver. 16. *I have reſerved thee.* העמדתיך. Lit. *I have made thee ſtand*. Comp. 1 Kings, 15. 4. and Prov. 29. 4.

Ver. 17. *As then thou exalteſt thyſelf*, &c. עודך מסתולל. Lit. *Adhuc tu te exaltans*. The root is סלל, and the word מסתולל ‖, the participle of *hithphael*, or the *reflective* voice, ſeems to denote that *ſelf-elevation* which reſembles a rampart made to oppoſe an enemy. The antients vary in rendering it. Sep. εμποιῃ, *thou inſulteſt*. Aq. αντιποιῃ, *thou oppoſeſt*. Sym. κατεχεις, *thou detaineſt*;—and equivalently Onk. Syr. Tharg. Saad. and Perſ.—But Arab. Erp. and Gr. Ven. have words that denote exaltation:—תתרפע—επαιρῃ. This meaning I have adopted. Dathe renders thus: *Si ulterius populum meum retinueris*. Roſenmüller: *Aggeris inſtar te opponis*.—The whole verſe is thus rendered by Michaëlis: "Willſt du dich "noch länger dem auszuge meines volks widerſetzen?"

Ver. 18. *A moſt grievous hail.* ברד כבד מאד. Literally rendered by Sep. χαλαζαν πολλην σφοδρα, and by Jerom, *grandinem multum nimis*. The other verſions are nearly to the ſame purport: but the Greek of Venice is here excellent: χαλαζαν βαρυτατην.—This would naturally be conſidered as a diſaſtrous omen, independently of the miſchief done by it. Hail falls ſo rarely in Egypt, that Volney thinks it hardly poſſible that it can happen once in fifty years. "The thermometer," ſays he, "which, at the loweſt in the month of February, "ſtands at the 8th or 9th degree of Reaumur's ſcale (50 or 52 of Fahrenheit's) above the "freezing-point, enables us to determine with certainty, that we may pronounce, that *ſnow*

* Tharg. שלפוקין. † *Furunculus efflorеſcens tuberculis:* as proper a verſion as any: perhaps the beſt of all.
‡ This too is a happy term, and the whole comma is well tranſlated. ‖ Five MSS. want the *vau*.

"and

"and *hail* are phænomena, which no Egyptian has ſeen in fifty years." Volney's Letters.—That it ſeldom rains or ſnows in Egypt, is pretty clear from the teſtimonies of both antients and moderns: yet both rain and ſnow are not unfrequently ſeen there. At Cairo, Alexandria, and Peluſium (ſays Proſper Alpinus), and in all the maritime parts of Egypt, it rains copiouſly and often: particularly in the month of November *. He adds, indeed, that ice and ſnow are very rarely ſeen †. Yet Monconys tells us, that, when he was in Egypt, it rained and hailed, with lightning and thunder, almoſt a whole night and part of a day in the month of January. And Pococke even in Upper Egypt met with hail in the month of February ‡. Hail then, although not common in Egypt, was not an unnatural phænomenon ||: but it was a phænomenon that might be very alarming to the Egyptians, both on account of its rarity, and of the damage that would naturally enſue from it, at that ſeaſon of the year.—From v. 23. and 24. we learn that *this* hail was, like that mentioned by Monconys, intermingled with lightning and thunder.—Indeed the intention of the Hebrew hiſtorian ſeems to have been, to aſſemble every ſort of calamity by which a nation, ſituated like Egypt, could poſſibly be afflicted: and in this he has been wonderfully ſagacious and ſucceſsful.

Ver. 28. *That there be an end of this mighty thunder and hail.* The Hebrew phraſe is ורב מהיות קולות אלהים וברד, *et ſat ſit fuiſſe voces Dei et grandinem. Thunder* is frequently called *the voice of God*; as a mighty *wind* is called his *breath:* but there is a ſingularity of conſtruction in the words ורב מהיות, which cannot be literally rendered in any other language. Roſenmüller, however, miſtakes in ſaying that it is not expreſſed by Sep. and Vulg. It is expreſſed, and well expreſſed, by the και παυσασθω του γενηθηναι of the former, and by the *ut deſinant* of the latter. It is likewiſe well expreſſed by Saadias וחסבנא מן אן יכון §. The Syr. tranſlator ſeems to have taken רב in a different meaning, as he renders the comma thus: צלו קדם מריא' ואית אתרא סגי קדמוהי—*Pray to God; for with him there is much reſpite.* And Onkelos appears to have had the ſame idea: צלו קדם יי וסגי קדמוהי רוח. Better the Thargums: ויהי סגי קדמוי.—The Perſic tanſlator ſeems to have conſidered ורב as belonging to the prior comma: "Pray the Lord, and *pray him* much; that, &c." And ſo Gr. Ven. Δεηθητε τουνυν προς τον οντω]ην πολυτε, απο του τελειν φωνας, κ. τ. λ. They, probably, did not well underſtand the Hebraiſm; the meaning of which, however, is clear, from a parallel place in Ezekiel, 44. 6. רב לכם מכל תועבתיכם, which literally is, *multum vobis ab omnibus abominationibus veſtris*: rendered by our Engliſh tranſlators, after the Greek, "Let it ſuffice you of all your "abominations ¶." Better the Vulgate: *Sufficiant vobis ſcelera veſtra.* Still better Houbigant: *Jam ſatis ſuperque eſt ſcelerum veſtrorum*—and Dathe: *Jam ſatis ſit ſcelerum a vobis commiſſorum.* Horace uſes a ſomewhat ſimilar phraſe—*Jam ſatis terris*, &c. Ode 2.

* "Cayri, quandoquidem, Alexandriæ Peluſiique, et in omnibus locis mari adjacentibus pluit largiſſime et ſæpe. "Novembrique facilius quam Decembri id accidit, quod eo menſe aer ſit frigidior." † "Rariſſimè glacies, "neque nix neque grando ibi viſitur: quum aer careat tanta frigiditate, qua hæc gigni queant." *De Medicin. Ægypt.* l. 1. p. 24. ‡ The very time when we may ſuppoſe the plague of hail to have happened. || Even from the Text of Exodus itſelf it may be inferred that hail was not altogether unknown in Egypt: ſince v. 24. it is ſaid that the hail then ſent was ſuch as had not been ſeen ſince Egypt had been a nation. § The Erpenian Arab endeavours literally, but barbarouſly, to render the Hebrew וכתיר אן יכון. ¶ I wonder this verſion was retained by Newcome.

Ver. 31. *The flax and the barley had been ſmitten.* That the Hebrew word פשתה ſignifies *flax*, there is little doubt; but what particular ſort of *bearded grain*, or rather what ſpecies of *barley*, is denoted by שעורה, is not altogether ſo certain. The Septuagint have κριθη; and all the verſions ſome equivalent term. Both flax and barley grew in Egypt to a great height. "I have ſeen" (ſays Haſſelquiſt) "a ſtem of flax four feet high, and as thick as the ſtem of a "common ruſh." Our flax-raiſers would not deem this laſt a good property; as, the ſlenderer the ſtem, the finer the filaments.—But what ſhall we think of the barley mentioned by Heliodorus; which riſes high enough to hide a man on horſeback, or even on the back of a camel?—Σταχυες, την μεν αυξησιν, ωστε και ἱππεα παντα και καμηλιτην εξιν ὁτε καλυπτειν. Heliod. apud Celſium.

Ib. *The flax bolling.* הפשתה גבעול. Thus rendered by the Antients—Sep. το δε λινον σπερματιζον.—Vulg. *linum jam folliculos germinaret.*—Onk. כתנא גבעולין.—Syr. כתנא כפת.—Saad. אלכתאן משלפא.—Erp. אלכתאן משלף *.—Tharg. Bab. כיתנא עבד פוקלין. All theſe verſions ſuppoſe, that the flax was paſt flowering, and either in full boll or bolling. The Jeruſalem Thargum expreſſes this more explicitly, by adding ואחרת נצה, *and had caſt its flower.*

The Hebrew word גבעול or גבעל is a quadriliteral, and occurs only here: its radical meaning is therefore doubtful. Michaëlis thinks, that it may be deduced from גביע *ſcyphus* or *calyx* in a botanical ſenſe, with the addition of *lamed* from ſome other root; in which caſe it will be the ſame as *flower*. This appears to me a forced derivation; and, indeed, Michaëlis himſelf ſeems not ſatisfied with it, as he adds two others. "Offerunt ſe גבל *craſſus*; et בעל *maritare:* ergo "erit, ſive *flos craſſeſcens*, ſemine concepto; ſive *flos maritatus*, i. e. ſemine ſtaminum maſ- "culinorum impregnatus." His miſapprehenſion of the Arabic verſions ſeems ſtill to haunt him: but ſuch Linnæan ideas were far, I believe, from the mind of either the tranſlators or original writer. Parkhurſt has, perhaps, given the true etymon "from גב *protuberant*, and "עלה *to aſcend*; which well expreſſes the formation of that *globous fruit* or *pod* on the top of "the ſtalk of flax, which ſucceeds the flower and contains the ſeed."

Ver. 32. *The wheat and the rye.* החטה והכסמת. That the firſt of theſe words, חטה, denotes *wheat*, is certain; but ſome have doubted whether the other word mean *rye*. It occurs but thrice, and is variouſly rendered by the antient tranſlators. Sep. has here ολυρα, and again in Ezek. 44. 20. but in Iſa. 28. 25. ζεα; which is generally ſuppoſed by Lexicographers to be but a different name for the ſame thing, and equivalent to the Latin *far*; the very word which Vulg. uſes here; although in Iſaiah and Ezekiel it has *vicia:* and the Erpenian Arab ſeems to have taken it in that ſenſe here, as he renders אלכרסנה, which is certainly a ſpecies of *vetch*. Saadias likewiſe took it to be ſomething of the leguminous kind, גלבאן, *cicercula* (miſprinted *circula* in the Polyglott verſion) or *a chickling*.—Aquila has ζεα; and Theod. ολυρα.—Onk. and Tharg. have כוסתיא and Syr. כוסתא, which are ſuppoſed to be the *millet*, or a ſpecies of it called *panicum*.—Perſ. גورگندم, *ſpelt:* and this ſeems to be the moſt probable meaning of the Hebrew word: at leaſt it has in its favour the greater number of in-

* Michaëlis, in his *Supplementa*, makes here a miſtake, which it may not be improper to rectify. He falſely ſuppoſes that both Arabs have משלק, and ſeeks the meaning in שלק *percutere ſenſu venereo*; i. e. *coire:* as if the tranſlators had meant to ſay, that the flax was at the time of *conceiving ſeed:* but the truth is, they both read the word with a *phe*, and not a *koph*, and the root is שלף, not שלק. Michaëlis did not attend to the *diacritic* point.

terpreters,

terpreters, from Jerom to Celsius. The following are the words of the former in his Comment. on Ezek. tom. iii. p. 722. "Quam nos vitiam (viciam) interpretati sumus, pro quo in "Hebræo dicitur *chasamim*; Septuaginta Theodotioque posuerunt ολυραν, quam alii *avenam*, "alii *sigalam* putant. Aquilæ autem prima editio et Symmachus ζεας, sive ζειας, interpretati "sunt: quas nos vel *far*, vel gentili Italiæ Pannoniæque sermone *spicam speltamque* dici-"mus."—There are not however wanting, who think it was *rye*; among whom was R. D. Kimhi; followed by Luther *(rocken)* and our English translators; not altered by Bate, Purver or Delgado. I too have retained it, although I am now inclined to think that *spelt* is preferable. Singular is the version of Gr. Ven. αιγιλοψ (probably a misprint for αιγιλωψ) *oats:* yet the Arabic translator of Isaiah and Ezekiel uses a word, שופן, which, some are of opinion, denotes *avena*, oats; while others think it means *secale*, *rye*. See Celsius, p. 98. and Forskal, p. 26.

Ib. *Because they were not yet unhosed.* I have here risked a provincial word to express the Hebrew אפילת; by *Sep.* rendered οψιμα*; *serotina* by Jerom; אפלתא by Onk.; by Syr. לקשין; and by Tharg. לקישן: all which (save Onk.) denote *serotination*, *latewardness*.—So equivalently both Arabs: but Pers. has a word, עליפאן, *obtecta*, *abdita*, *cooperta*; *covered over:* and this I take to be the true meaning of the Hebrew word. The ears of the *wheat* and *spelt* were yet in the tubal envelope, which covers them like *a stocking* or *hose*. I have heard the term used by country farmers, and thought it would be pretty generally understood. I might have said, *unsheathed*. For the rest, I am persuaded that the word אפילת cannot signify *serotina*, οψιμα, or any such *term*, but in a metonymical sense; although Fuller (Miscell. Sacr. lib. 3. c. 11.) has laboured to prove the contrary.

CHAP. X.

Ver. 1. *THESE my wonders.* אותתי אלה†. The word *my*, μου, is wanting in Sep. Ald. and Rom. But it is in Alex. Glasg. Canon. and the Complutensian edition, although unnoticed by Bos. It was also read by Austin in the old Italic; and by all the other antient translators, save Syr. and Copt. nor is it wanting in any Heb. or Sam. MSS.

Ib. *Among them.* The present Text has בקרבו, which our English translators render "before him." But בקרב never signifies *before*; nor is it elsewhere so rendered in our public version. Most of the antient interpreters seem either to have read בקרבם, or to have considered the affix *vau* as a collective pronoun, denoting Pharaoh and his servants, or perhaps the whole Egyptian people. As there is no variety of lection either in the Heb. or Sam. copies, I am inclined to think בקרבו the original reading; but that the antients very properly rendered it in the plural: Sep. επ' αυτους—Syr. בינתהון—Onk. and Tharg. בינידון—Saad. בהם.—Jerom, Pers. Arab. Erp. and Gr. Ven. render in the singular, but somewhat differently. Jerom, *in eo*. Pers. דר מיאני או, *in medio ejus*. Erp. פי וסטה, equally literal. Gr. Ven. εν

* Gr. Ven. has likewise οψιμω, in the dual: οψιμω γαρ ητην. † For so it is fully and rightly written in 5 Sam. and 1 Heb. MSS. Five other Sam. MSS. have אתותי, and 1 has אותתי, all more full and better than the present meagre reading אתתי.

τῷ μεσῳ ὁι. All theſe interpreters ſeem to have conſidered בקרבו equal to בו, and to ſignify *in propria perſona*; or, as Le Gros renders, "en ſa perſonne."—Diodati and the Engliſh Genevans took another way to ſave the anomaly. The former renders: "in mezzo del ſuo "paeſe;" the latter: "in the midſt of his realm." So, likewiſe, Druſius: *in medio regni ejus*; and Junius: *in medio Ægypti.*—I have, without heſitation, rendered in the plural; following the antients, Luther, the old French of Geneva *, Caſtalio, Le Clerc, Le Cene, Dathe, Michaëlis, Hezel, Bate, Purver.

Ver. 2. *That ye may have to tell*, &c. In the original it is, "that THOU may have to tell:" as addreſſed to every individual of the Iſraelitic people. This ſubſtitution of a ſingular for a plural is extremely frequent in the Hebrew idiom, particularly in the Pentateuch. I ſhall not, therefore, any more remark on it: as I almoſt conſtantly render in the plural: except in the Decalogue; for a reaſon there given.

Ib. *How ſeverely I treated the Egyptians.* את אשר התעללתי במצרים;—which our tranſlators render "what things I have wrought in Egypt," from Pagninus's *quæ feci in Ægypto.* But this by no means conveys the force of the original. The Hebrew word ſignifies to *play upon one*, to *divert one's ſelf at the expenſe of another*; to *treat one with ſcorn*; correſponding with the Latin *ludificari:* and hence ſome of our firſt tranſlators rendered the comma "the "pageantes which I have played in Egypt."—Sep. εμπεπαιχα †, *illuſi*, I *illuded*, or *played upon.* Jerom and Saadias very probably underſtood the word in the ſame ſenſe; although they gave it a different turn; the former: *quoties contriverim Ægyptios*; the latter: מא נטשת באלמצריין, *quomodo calcaverim Ægyptios*; or *how roughly I handled the Egyptians.* If Onkelos and the other interpreters uſed words that denote ſimply to *do*, or *work*; it was probably owing to their being unwilling to put a term of *ludification* in the mouth of God.—It is a pity, that the verſions of Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion are, here, loſt: as in them, eſpecially in that of Aquila, we might have hoped to ſee the force of the original literally preſerved.—The modern Jews, in general, I believe, acquieſce in the rendering of Onkelos and the Thargums, עבדית; yet Rabbi Solomon Jarhi expreſsly avers that התעללתי cannot have that meaning; and renders it by a word (שחקתי) perfectly equivalent to the εμπεπαιχα of Sep.—He juſtly adds that it has the ſame meaning in 1 Sam. 6. 6. which relates to the ſame tranſaction: and where Sep. has again the ſame verb, ενεπαιξεν.—I have no doubt, then, of the meaning being *to mock, affront, make a fool of:* but I have, in imitation of Saadias, mollified the expreſſion, to diveſt it of its ludicrous air.—For the reſt, I take מצרים not for *Egypt*, but for the Egyptians, with Sep. Vulg. Syr. and both Arabs. The verb is in the ſame ſort of conſtruction in Sam. התעלל בהם, *ludificatus eſt in eos.*

Ver. 5. *The locuſts.* ארבה. Of all inſects the moſt dreadful is the locuſt. It ſets all the defenſive arts of man at defiance, and in a few days deſtroys the beautiful verdure of vaſt tracts of cultivated country. "I once (ſays Ruſſel) had an opportunity to ſee large ſwarms "in the iſle of Cyprus; and till that time had no idea of their numerous hoſts, and rapacious

* "Au milieu d'eux:" but the laſt reviſers thought proper to turn it into "au dedans de lui."—Houbigant, "apud "eum:" but the Hebrew word ſignifies not *apud*, any more than *ante*. † Some copies have εμπεπραχα, or ενπεπραχα; but theſe, I ſuſpect, are modern corrections: as both the Coptic verſion and the Italic expreſs the other reading.

"depredations.

"depredations. In going in a chaiſe from Larnica to a garden at the diſtance of four or "five miles, the locuſts lay ſwarming *above a foot deep* in ſeveral parts of the high road; "and thouſands were deſtroyed by the wheels craſhing over them."—It ſeems they touch not the ripe corn; but every thing green they deſtroy—the cotton-plant, the mulberry and fig-leaves, and even the leaves of the olive.—The locuſt-bird (*turdus roſeus*), which providentially appears at the ſame time, is of great ſervice on ſuch occaſions, and on that account is much reſpected by the Turks.—Thoſe who wiſh to learn what dreadful havoc has been, in every age, committed by ſwarms of locuſts, may conſult Bochart, Hierozoic. lib. iv. c. 4. 5. 6. —See alſo Bar-Hebræus paſſim, and our modern travellers, Shaw, Thevenot, Le Brun, Forſkal, Adanſon, Volney.—Perhaps no country has been more afflicted with them than Egypt: but on the preſent occaſion they are ſaid to have been ſuch as *never were ſeen* before: i. e. they were extremely numerous and offenſive.

Ver. 5. *That it will be impoſſible to ſee the earth.* לא יוכל לראות את הארץ. Houbigant thinks יוכל a tranſcriber's blunder, and that we ſhould read תוכל; becauſe the conſtruction requires an active verb, and becauſe the Septuagint render it by δυνησῃ. But this is finding blunders, without a reaſon: יוכל is an active verb; and the word איש is underſtood, and well ſupplied by Syr. and Saad. Jerom gave the comma a different turn: *ne quidquam ejus (terræ) appareat:* and Onkelos paraphraſes thus: "ſo that the ſun's rays ſhall not be able to pene-"trate to it." There is no exaggeration in all this, as the above quotation from Ruſſel ſhews. See alſo Livy, lib. xlii. 10. and Pliny, lib. xi. 35.

Ver. 7. *How long ſhall this be a ſnare for us?* עד מתי יהיה זה לנו למוקש. Sep. Εως τινος εσται τουτο ἡμιν σκωλον; Vulg. *Uſquequo patiemur hoc ſcandalum?* And ſo equivalently all the verſions down to the Greek of Venice, which very well and very literally renders, Αχρι τινος ὑπαρξει τουδε ἡμιν εις σκανδαλητρον;—Some moderns, however, think that זה ought to be tranſlated *he*, namely Moſes: as if the ſervants of Pharaoh had ſaid: "How long will this *man* be "a ſnare to us?" or as Dathe: *Quouſque vir ille nobis erit perniciouſus?*—Michaëlis: "Wie "lange ſoll der mann uns zum verderben gereichen?"—And Hezel: "Wie lange ſoll "dieſer (mann, Moſes) zur falle (zum werkzeug der beſtrickung) ſeyn * ?"—I am perſuaded that they are all wrong; and that זה relates to the conduct of Pharaoh in obſtinately refuſing to let go the Iſraelites, although that refuſal had already almoſt ruined Egypt. Houbigant, leſs naturally I think, refers it to the plagues themſelves: *Quamdiu hæc nos illaqueabunt?*

Ver. 10. *So may the Lord be with you, as I let go both yourſelves and your families!* יהי כן יהוה עמכם כאשר אשלח אתכם ואת טפכם. Although the meaning be clear enough from the context, yet the words have been variouſly underſtood and rendered. The Septuagint verſion is Εχω ουτω Κυριος μεθ' ὑμων· καθοτι αποχελλω ὑμας, μη και την αποσκευην ὑμων, rendered by Nobilius: *Sit ſic Dominus vobiſcum: ſicut demitto vos, nunquid et ſupellectilem veſtram.*—This, it muſt be confeſſed, is an odd manner of phraſing, and indeed hardly intelligible. The word μη comes in moſt awkwardly before και, and I ſuſpect that it is an interloper. The author of *Commentaries and Eſſays* thinks that it has only been tranſpoſed, and that we ſhould

* So likewiſe our laſt Engliſh tranſlators; very properly corrected by Delgado thus: "How long ſhall this *matter* "be a ſnare unto us?"

read

read καὶ μη: and by this reading would correct the Hebrew thus: ואל טפכם, *ſed non familias veſtras.* "If this reading be adopted," ſays he, "all will be clear and conſiſtent; and the "paſſage will run thus: Let Jehovah be ſo with you, as I ſhall let you go: but not your little "ones. Not ſo (or wherefore, Sam. לכן) go now ye that are men; for that is what ye de-"ſired.—The requeſt of Moſes to Pharaoh was at firſt of a general nature, to let the people "go to ſacrifice to Jehovah in the wilderneſs; but no particular mention of *little ones:* this "perhaps Pharaoh takes hold of in the cloſe of his ſpeech. With the above alteration of one "letter, all ſeeming contradiction will be removed."—It is indeed but a ſeeming contradiction, grounded on a falſe aſſumption; namely that the firſt comma of Pharaoh's ſpeech is "a conſent, confirmed by a kind of oath or imprecation, to let the Iſraelites go with their "little ones." So far from being a *conſent*, it is one of the ſtrongeſt refuſals he could make; as we ſhall ſee preſently.

Houbigant, who often ſaw more clearly than moſt commentators, here involves himſelf in a cloud of obſcurity. He points after עמכם, and renders the whole verſe thus: *Dixit eis Pharao: quo quo modo ego vos demittam, erit vobiſcum Dominus. Sed videtis in ea veſtra multitudine ſubeſſe contra vos ſuſpicionem.* Which very ſtrange interpretation he ſupports by the following ſtranger note: "Pharaone ſic dicente: Tam vobis aderit Deus veſter, ſi ego vos "cum paucis demiſero, quam ſi cum multis. Propterea, ſubdit Pharao, *ite cum viris*, cæte-"ram multitudinem proficiſci vetans. Neque nectendum fuit את טפכם cum eo אתכם quod "antecedit. Nam quicunque id fecere, ſeu veteres ſeu recentiores, nihil jam certi habue-"runt in ultima parte versûs, quod ſequeretur: quippe cum, niſi טפכם ad ראו jungitur, "maneat ſententia ab ראו uſque ad finem trunca et mutila. Nec non recuſat ultima pars "versûs, ne in ראו abrupta et ſine nexu veniat. Sed ראו, ad טפכם cum jungitur, ſic dicit "Pharao: *ſed multitudinem veſtram videte, quia ſuſpicio eſt coram facie veſtra:* i. e. ea multi-"tudo reliqua, quam abducere vultis, conſilium veſtrum prodit, et ſpeciem habet doli: de-"monſtrat vos ita proficiſci velle, ut non ſitis regreſſuri. Habet רעה apud veteres linguas, "*cogitationem, conſilium, ſuſpicionem*: etiam in Syr. lingua תתרעה *ſuſpectum eſſe.* Parum "opportunè quidam advocant ironiam, quorum ex numero Clericus, qui Pharaonem interpre-"tatur ſic fuiſſe locutum: *ut vos dimittam, ita opto vobis pacem Jehovæ; hoc eſt, utinam vos malè "mulctet.* Quis credat Pharaonem omnibus malis afflictum, et ad deſperationem propè ad-"ductum, in re tam gravi jocum adhibuiſſe, aut in ambiguis luſiſſe verbis?"—Perhaps there is not another example of a Scripture text being more cruelly tortured and disjointed than this. It cannot, with any ſhade of propriety, be pointed otherwiſe than it is: nor can it have any other meaning than what Le Clerc has given to it. Vatable had preceded him: whoſe ſhort note is excellent. "Hebraiſmus: vellem Dominum non majori animo eſſe erga vos, ut vos "juvet, quam ſum ut vos dimittam, &c. ac ſi dicat: *nunquam ſum demiſſurus vos cum "parvulis.*"—Indeed the paſſage has always to me appeared perfectly clear. It is the ſame as if we were to ſay in Engliſh: "If I do let you go with your families, then may the Lord be "with you!"—Is there any obſcurity in this?—I know ſome Rabbis tell us, that Pharaoh, in the firſt comma, gives his conſent; but looking at Moſes and Aaron, and ſuſpecting deceit in their looks, he revokes it in the laſt comma. But all this is mere trifling.—I ſhall only add the elegant verſions of Dathe and Michaëlis: "Ita vobis Jova adſit, uti ego vos et liberos "veſtros

" veſtros dimittam!"—" Eur Jehova ſey ſo mit euch, als ich euch mit euren kinderen ziehen " laſſen will!"—I have not rendered טף *little ones*; becauſe its meaning is much more extenſive; comprehending women, children, ſlaves; in a word, the whole family, bag and baggage. Here and in ſeveral other places it is rendered by Sep. αποσκευη.

Ib. *See what evil views ye have.* ראו כי רעה נגד פניכם. Lit. " See what evil is before your " faces:" i. e. your views are now clearly ſeen—ye mean not to return. It is well rendered by Sep. ιδετε ὁτι πονηρια προσκειται ὑμιν: not badly, although paraphraſtically, by Vulg. *cui dubium eſt, quod peſſimè cogitetis.*

Ver. 11. *Not ſo.* לא כן. The Sam. copies have לכן *therefore*; which Houbigant prefers. " Nos ſequemur ſcripturam Sam. לכן, 'quapropter exeant viri.' Nam ſi diceret Pharao, *non* " *ſic*, ſubjungeret, *ſed ite*; non omiſsâ in tranſitu particulâ." Doubtleſs, the Sam. is a very appoſite reading: yet as all the antient interpreters, from Sep. to Gr. Ven. read with the preſent Hebrew, I ſee no reaſon to depart from it.—With more reaſon Houbigant prefers the Sam. reading וינרשו in the ſame verſe, which was the reading of Sep. Syr. and Vulg. which our tranſlators followed.—The Hebrew reading might, however, be defended; and could be rendered in German and French: " Mann ſtieſs ſie heraus"—" On les chaſſa."—It is worthy of remark, that the word which we render *men*, in this verſe, is חגברים *the chief men*, maſters of families.

Ver. 12. *For the locuſts.* בארבה. This is ſo uncommon a conſtruction, that I am much inclined to conſider the Greek reading, και αναβητω ακρις, as the true one; and that the text originally ſtood thus: ויעל הארבה.

Ib. *And the fruit of every tree.* This addition in the Sam. copies is corroborated by the authority of Sep. and by the context. The Hebrew is inconſiſtent. In ver. 5. it has *trees* only; in ver. 12. it has *green herbs* only; but in ver. 15. it has both: that is, it is twice defective, and once full: whereas the Sam. is uniformly the ſame: a plain proof of its ſuperiority, in my eſtimation; whatever the Hottingeriſts may ſay to the contrary.

Ver. 13. *An eaſt wind.* רוח קדים. Sep. here and elſewhere have νοτον, the *ſouth wind*; and their authority has induced ſome modern interpreters ſo to render. They think this the more probable, becauſe locuſts invade Egypt chiefly from the ſouth. But etymology is ſo clearly againſt this interpretation, that it cannot be admitted. That קדם ſignifies the *eaſt*, is univerſally agreed: רוח קדים then muſt neceſſarily be the *eaſt-wind*, and the locuſts in queſtion muſt have come from Arabia. Jerom renders *ventum urentem*, a *burning wind*, for which he is ſeverely blamed by Amama: yet Aquila and Symmachus ſo underſtood it, καυσωνα: and ſo it is rendered by Sep. as often as it is rendered νοτος; ſo that they ſeem to have conſidered them as ſynonimous terms. Syr. too has רוחא דשובא, *ventum urentem.* But Onk. Tharg. Perſ. both Arabs *, and Gr. Ven. † have words that denote the *eaſt wind.*

Ver. 14. *Will never be.* לא יהיה. Sep. ουκ εσαι. Vulg. *nec poſtea futuri ſunt.* And ſo equivalently all the other verſions. But Houbigant tranſlates both commas in the paſt: *quales nunquam fuerant, nec poſt fuerunt:* and this may really have been the author's meaning.

* I ſay both Arabs; although the Latin tranſlator of Saadias has rendered *auſtrum.* The word is אלקבול.

† πνευμα αφηλιωτον.

It is not here the Lord or Moſes who ſpeaks prophetically; but the hiſtorian who narrates the event. He therefore would more naturally ſay: *ſuch a thing had never been before, nor has been ſeen ſince*; than, *was ever ſeen before, or will ever be ſeen again.*

Ver. 15. *They ſo covered the face of the whole country, that the earth was darkened.*—"The quantities of locuſts," ſays Volney, "that ſometimes ravage Syria, are incredible to all "who have not witneſſed their aſtoniſhing numbers. The whole earth is covered with them "for ſeveral leagues. The noiſe which they make in browzing on the trees and herbs may "be heard at a great diſtance, and reſembles that of an army foraging in ſecret. The Tar-"tars themſelves are not a more deſtructive enemy."—I will give one more quotation on locuſts, from Bar-Hebræus: but, not to frighten my reader with ſo much Syriac at once, I ſhall give it in Bruns's tranſlation. "Anno Græcorum 1095 (Chriſti 784) irruerunt locuſtæ vo-"lantes, corruperunt ſemina, projecto ſemine ſerpſerunt, aſcenderunt muros atque parietes, "et e feneſtris et portis domos ingreſſæ ſunt. Impletæ iis ſunt hydriæ, pavimenta, menſæ, "catini. Poſtquam a latere meridionali domos intraverant, a latere ſeptentrionali egredie-"bantur, conſumptis herbis, arboribus, etiam veſtimentis laneis et indumentis hominum. "Vaſtatâ omni regione Edeſſenâ et Sarugenſi, occidentem verſus tranſierunt." Chron. Syr. p. 133 in the tranſlation; but 134 in the original.

Ver. 17. *This calamity.* המות הזה. Lit. *this death.* Not only famine, but often peſtilence, ſucceeds the locuſts. Hear Jerom: "Etiam noſtris temporibus vidimus agmina locuſtarum "terram texiſſe Judæam, quæ poſtea, miſericordiâ Domini, vento ſurgente, in mare primum "et noviſſimum præcipitatæ ſunt..... cumque littora utriuſque maris acervis mortuarum lo-"cuſtarum, quas aquæ evomuerant, implerentur, putredo earum et fœtor in tantum noxius "fuit, ut aërem quoque corrumperet, et peſtilentia tam jumentorum quam hominum gigne-"retur." Comment. in Joel, tom. iii. p. 1354.

Ver. 19. *A very ſtrong weſt wind.* רוח ים חזק מאד. Lit. *a ſea-wind, ſtrong exceedingly.* The Hebrews denominated the weſt from the Mediterranean ſea, which lay to the weſt of Paleſtine. But here, perhaps, the words might be literally explained with reſpect to Egypt; and called the *ſea-wind*; which, blowing from Alexandria or the north-weſt, would carry the locuſts the way of the Red-ſea.—Pauſanias (Attics, l. i. c. 24.) tells us that, in his days, a ſwarm of locuſts from Mount Sipylus were carried away in the ſame manner by a ſudden and vehement wind, which was aſcribed to Apollo.—In Syria, according to Volney, a ſouth or ſouth-eaſt wind is the moſt efficacious deſtroyer of locuſts.

Ib. *The Red ſea.* ים סוף. *The ſea of Suph.* The word סוף is commonly underſtood to be *ſea-ſedges, alga marina*, in German *meer-graſs*, and *ware* in ſome of our provinces. But if we can believe Bruce, there is no *weed* of any ſort in the Red-ſea; and he thinks that the word סוף denotes the *coral*, of "which large trees are ſpread every where over the bottom of the "Red-ſea, perfectly in imitation of plants on land." One of thoſe trees he ſaw, "which, "from a root nearly central, threw out ramifications in a nearly circular form, meaſuring "26 feet in diameter, every way *."—But this aſſertion of Mr. Bruce's has to ſome appeared very queſtionable: and the ratiocination which accompanies it ſerves only to increaſe our

* Bruce's Travels, vol. i. p. 237.

doubt.

doubt. " Indeed," ſays he, " upon the ſlighteſt conſideration it will occur to any one that a " narrow gulf, under the immediate influence of monſoons blowing from contrary points ſix " months each year, would have too much agitation to produce ſuch vegetables, ſeldom found " but in ſtagnant waters, and ſeldomer, if ever, in *ſalt ones*."—Where the bottom of the ſea is mere ſand, this is probably true: but who has ever ſeen a rocky ſea-ſhore without vegetables and weeds of various ſorts, growing in the ſalt water, and reſiſting the moſt violent tides?

Ver. 21. *Darkneſs.* חשך. The ſame word that is uſed to expreſs the darkneſs that covered the deep, at the time of the ſix days' creation, Gen. 1. 2. Here it is ſaid, in the ſame verſe, to be a darkneſs which *one may feel*, וימש חשך, well rendered by Sep. ψηλαφητον σκοτος. Vulg. *quæ palpari queant.* Gr. Ven. και ψηλαφησει σκοτος. Perſ. בּרמסד תאריכי. *Palpabit* (quis) *tenebras.* All theſe agree in rendering the word ימש; which they conſidered as the 3 p. ſing. of the fut. of משש *palpare.* But Onk. Tharg. and Saad. conſidered it as a part of the verb מוש; and render " when the darkneſs (of night) *ſhall be gone:*"—a very unnatural reading, but a plain proof that their text had no vowel-points; or that they paid no attention to them. What the Syr. tranſlator ſaw in his text, it is hard to ſay: but it is probable that both he and Arab. Erp. read and underſtood as we do; but thought the word *palpable* too ſtrong an expreſſion, and ſoftened it into ſomething like an equivalent. The former has ונעמט חשכא, *and denſe ſhall be the darkneſs:* The latter ויטלם אלטלאם, much to the ſame purport.—Although Egypt is in general bleſt with a clear ſerene ſky, and conſequently darkneſs in the day-time would be a tremendous phenomenon; yet we find that this is not the only inſtance of its having happened. In the chaliphat of Almoſtaali-Ahhmedis, ſo thick a darkneſs overwhelmed Egypt, that all believed the laſt day to be at hand. It was accompanied with a dreadful tempeſt *.—And again, in the chaliphat of Alhhakam-Almanſur, the whole air in Egypt was involved in the deepeſt darkneſs: " Eæ tenebræ per Ægyptum obortæ ſunt, ut totus aër cæca " caligine ſuerit involutus; ventus vero ſimul concitatus eſt adeò vehemens, ut diem ultimum " nemo non metuerit; à tempore pomeridiano uſque ad ſolis occaſum ſæviebat tempeſtas: " tum vero lux emicuit †."—Our Egyptian darkneſs, however, was of a much longer duration: it laſted three days.—Philo ſuppoſes, that it might be partly owing to a greater than uſual eclipſe of the ſun, and partly to an uncommon collection of clouds. " But all " the children of Iſrael," we are told, " had light in their dwellings." Neither the eclipſe, it ſeems, nor the clouds of Philo, obſcured the land of Goſhen: nor is this, with reſpect to the clouds at leaſt, altogether improbable: we have ſeen the higher parts of a country, and the more remote from rivers, perfectly clear when the lower and circumfluvial parts were covered with miſt; and we have had almoſt palpable darkneſs in London, when there was none at Hampſtead.

In conſequence of this darkneſs, Pharaoh is repreſented as willing to let go the whole body of Iſraelites, old and young, great and ſmall, on condition that they leave their flocks and herds as a pledge of their return from the wilderneſs, when they ſhall have ſacrificed to the Lord their God; but when Moſes plainly tells him, that " not a ſingle hoof ſhall be left " behind," the monarch's heart is ſo hardened, and hardened too by Jehovah, that he obſti-

* Jemaledin. Hiſt. Calipharum Fatimitarum; ex verſione Carlyle, p. 13. † Ib. p. 16.

nately refuſes to let the people go; nay threatens Moſes with death, if he preſume to ſhew his face again. Well might the hiſtorian ſay that it was the Lord who *hardened his heart*; for if all had literally paſſed before his eyes, that is here related, it required almoſt as great a miracle *to harden his heart*, as any that had preceded.—Moſes however accedes to the propoſition: "Thou haſt well ſpoken; I ſhall no more ſee thy face."

But how is this reconcileable with the next chapter, where Moſes is ſaid to have communicated a new divine meſſage to Pharaoh? It appeared ſo irreconcileable to Houbigant, that he was for throwing ver. 28. and 29. of ch. x. into ch. xi. after ver. 8. His reaſons are: 1ſt. It is not credible, that, after Moſes is angrily diſmiſſed by Pharaoh, and aſſures him he ſhall no more ſee his face, he ſhould again appear before him, and addreſs him as in ver. 5, 6, 7, and 8, of ch. xi. And, as againſt this objection it might be urged, that Moſes, when he made this addreſs, had not departed from the preſence of Pharaoh, Houbigant, 2dly. aſks, if it be credible that the words of God to Moſes, which are related ch. xi. 1. and 2. were ſpoken to Moſes in the preſence and hearing of Pharaoh?—3dly. Do the words "Now Moſes "was a very great man, &c." appear to be in their proper place between God's ſpeech to Moſes and Moſes's repetition of it to Pharaoh?—4thly. Is it a proper arrangement to make Moſes, ch. xi. 5. ſay that the firſt-born in Egypt ſhall die at midnight, before the Lord has told him that ſuch an event was to happen?—To this laſt queſtion we muſt anſwer, Certainly no: and ſo far I agree with Houbigant, that the omiſſion of God's words to Moſes in the preſent Hebrew Text is, to me, an evident proof that it has been mutilated, and that the Sam. copies have preſerved the genuine original Text. Follow, then, this Text,—all will be right; and Houbigant's firſt and ſecond objection fairly anſwered.—The third objection is more plauſible, and ſtaggered Dr. Kennicott; who takes a ſtrange way to ſolve it. He makes ver. 3. of ch. xi. a part of God's ſpeech to Moſes: "And THOU ALSO SHALT be greatly ho-"noured, &c.;" and gives this as the reading of the Sam. Text. But this is a miſtake: the Sam. Text, here, agrees with the Hebrew; ſave that it has the copulative before גם, with Sep. Vulg. and Saadias; and ſo it was, at firſt, written in one of De Roſſi's MSS.; perhaps in one of Kennicott's; and in a MS. copy of Tharg.—All the antient verſions here accord with the Heb. and Sam. Texts; ſave that in Sep. are the following varieties. Rom. with Alex. and Copt. have: *και ὁ ανθρωπος Μωυσης μεγας εγενηθη σφοδρα εναντιον των Αιγυπτιων, και εναντιον Φαραω, και εναντιον των θεραποντων αυτου.* "Now the man Moſes was very great, in the eyes of the Egyp-"tians, and in the eyes of Pharaoh, and in the eyes of his ſervants." Complut. and Glaſg. have *παντων* before *των θεραποντων.* The Aldine has this addition, *και εν οφθαλμοις παντος του λαου*; which appears to be an interpolation from the Hebrew, as the phraſeology is different from that of the preceding commas.—It ſeems clear, however, that the Septuagint read in their copies בעיני מצרים, inſtead of בארץ מצרים. Five of Kennicott's MSS. have the ſame reading; and three others have בארץ written upon a razure, which was probably at firſt written בעיני. But there is no copy or verſion that juſtifies Dr. Kennicott's changing the *third* perſon into the *ſecond*. We muſt, therefore, either admit, with Houbigant, that the colon is out of its place; or ſay, that it is an incidental parentheſis, as indeed I take it to be; and flatter myſelf that its ſuppoſed impropriety, where it ſtands, diſappears in my verſion; which faithfully expreſſes the Sam. and Hebrew Texts united.

CHAP.

CHAP. XI.

I NEED not obſerve to the leaſt intelligent reader that this chapter, in the common diviſion, is unnaturally disjointed from the preceding one.

Ver. 2. *Let every man aſk*, &c. ישאלו—which our Engliſh tranſlators render *borrow*; and have, perhaps without much reaſon, been blamed for ſo rendering. That the word ſometimes ſignifies to *borrow* is certain *; and I ſee no ſufficient reaſon for giving it another meaning here. It is more likely that the Egyptians would lend their jewels and raiments to the Iſraelites, for the purpoſe of celebrating a national feſtival, than that they would make preſents of them. They had no idea that the borrowers were not to return. But our theologians are afraid leſt it ſhould be imagined, that if the word *borrow* were here uſed, it would make God command the Iſraelites to do a fraudful unlawful action: but is this the only inſtance of an unlawful action being commanded by God; I mean, according to the Hebrew hiſtorians? At a proper time, I ſhall point out many ſuch commands.—Meanwhile, let us ſee how commentators get rid of the preſent difficulty. "It is here aſked," ſays Calmet, "if God "does not command, or at leaſt adviſe, the women of Iſrael to commit a theft; in bidding "them borrow from the Egyptians veſſels of gold and ſilver, which they never meant to "return? It may be anſwered, that God, on this occaſion, *diſpenſed* the Hebrews from the "law which forbids theft; or rather that, as abſolute maſter of all things, he transferred to "the Hebrews the property of goods which, before that, belonged to the Egyptians. We "may add, with Melchior Canus, that, the Egyptians having unjuſtly diſtreſſed the Iſraelites "by inſupportable labour, theſe had a right to indemnify themſelves, by retaining what ap-"pertained to the former, eſpecially as they had no other mean of doing themſelves juſtice. "The author of the Book of Wiſdom, or rather the Holy Ghoſt who ſpeaks through him, "furniſhes us with another mode of excuſing the Iſraelites, when he ſays: 'The JUST carried "off the ſpoils of the WICKED:' *Juſti tulerunt ſpolia impiorum* †.—The Egyptians were the "enemies of God and of his people.—The Maſter of Sentences ‡ excuſes the ſin of the "Iſraelites, who acted (he ſays) on this occaſion with ſimplicity and good faith: but with "reſpect to thoſe who abandoned themſelves to their bad deſires and inclinations, we cannot "excuſe them; much leſs accuſe God of having engaged them in evil: for, on this rencoun-"ter, God *commanded* not the Iſraelites, he only *permitted* them, to employ fraud and artifice "againſt a people, who, in puniſhment of their malice and crimes, *deſerved to be cheated and* "*ſpoiled of their goods*."—Would you ſuppoſe, my good reader, that the above could be written by a Chriſtian commentator? It was written by one of the moſt celebrated Chriſtian commentators of the eighteenth century! Yet it is only the echo of the more antient Chriſtian fathers, guided by a maxim everſive, in my idea, of all juſtice and morality; namely, that whatever is reported by the Hebrew writers to have been ordered or approved of by God, muſt neceſſarily be right and lawful. The reader who may have the curioſity to ſee how they defend

* See Exod. 22, 14. 2 Kings, 6, 5. † Calmet quotes the Vulg. The Greek has Δικαιοι εσκυλευσαν ασεβεις. ‡ Peter Lombard.

the

the *ſpoiling of the Egyptians*, may conſult Irenæus, lib. iv. c. 49.—Clement of Alexandria Strom. lib. *i*. p. 345. ed. Sylburg.—Tertullian, contra Marcion. c. 20—Theodoret, Quæſt. 23. in Exod. tom. i. p. 138 novæ edit. * above all, Auguſtin. contra Fauſt. lib. xxii. c. 72. who anſwers the very rational objection of his acute adverſary in this very curious manner: "Quid ergo jam de expoliatis Ægyptiis Fauſtus objecit, neſciens quid loquatur? Quod faciendo, "Moyſes *uſque adeo non peccavit, ut non faciendo peccaret.* Deus enim juſſerat, qui utique "novit non ſolum ſecundum facta, verumetiam ſecundum cor hominis, quid unuſquiſque, vel "per quem perpeti debeat. Carnalis itaque adhuc ille populus erat, et rerum terrenarum "cupiditate occupatus; Ægyptii vero ſacrilegi et iniqui: nam et auro illo, hoc eſt Dei crea-"tura, malè utentes, ad Creatoris injuriam ſuis idolis ſerviebant; et homines peregrinos labore "gratuito injuſtè ac vehementer afflixerant: *digni ergo erant et iſti, quibus talia juberentur*; *et* "*illi, qui talia paterentur* †."

How much more honeſt our Cartwright: "At certè, ſi Iſraelitæ ab Ægyptiis mutuabantur "ea, quæ ab illis habebant, fidem feſellerunt ac dolosè cum eis egerunt, cum res mutuo ac-"ceptas nec reddiderunt; nec, cum peterent, reddere in animo habuerint." Certainly, if the Hebrews borrowed jewels and other things from the Ægyptians, for the purpoſe of a pretended feſtival, and without the deſign of reſtoring them, they acted a deceitful and deluſive part, which no caſuiſtry can juſtify.—Hence Joſephus, Antiq. lib. ii. c. 14. takes another method to elude the objection. He tells us that the Ægyptians preſſed theſe things upon the Hebrews by way of preſents, partly that they might accelerate their exit, and partly out of good neighbourhood: δωροις τε τους Εβραιους ετιμων, οἱ μεν ὑπερ του ταχιον εξελθειν, οἱ δε και κατα γειτνιακην προς αυτους συνηθειαν. This idea has been generally adopted by our more recent interpreters; who render *aſk*, inſtead of *borrow*. According to this interpretation, the Egyptians gave to the Iſraelites whatſoever they aſked, as a free gift, which they expected not to be reſtored: but why then is it ſaid, ch. 3. 22. and again ch. 12. 36. that they were to *ſpoil*, and actually *ſpoiled*, the Egyptians; יצלו את מצרים? Can one be ſaid to be *ſpoiled* of what he gratuitouſly gives? To me it is clear, that, whether we render שאל by *aſk*, or *borrow*, the Hebrews were guilty of inexcuſable fraudulency; which, conſequently, could not, in reality, be commanded or authoriſed by a juſt God. They *borrowed*, or *aſked*, what they never meant to repay, either in ſpecies or equivalent; and effectually *ſpoiled* the credulous Egyptians, who believed they were only going a three-days' journey into the deſert, to hold a feſtival to their own God, Jehovah. —Cyrill of Alexandria gives a reaſon why the Hebrew women were chiefly employed in this tranſaction, and anſwers that it was "becauſe the ſex is moſt fit for loquacious goſſiping, and "moſt artful in deviſing deceit." Ψιθυρον γαρ αει πως εςι το χρημα και λαλιστατον, και προς απατην ευμηχανον. De Adorat. in Spirit. lib. i. tom. i. p. 45. The good Father ſeems to have been tolerably acquainted with ſome part of female nature.

Ver. 4. *About midnight I will go through the land of Egypt, and every firſt-born in the land*

* His words are: Πολυν εν Αιγυπτῳ χρονον ὑπεμειναν ὁ λαος, πλινθουργων και τειχοποιων, και πολεις οικοδομων· ηδ υλη θη τοινυν μισθον αυτους των πονων λαβειν ὁ δεσποτης Θεος· διο δη και ταυτα δρασαι προσεταξε. Και μηδεις αδικον νομιζετο, του Φαραω τον λαον ηδικηκοτος, τους Αιγυπτιους τον μισθον εισπραχθηναι· εκοινωνουν γαρ κἀκειναι της αδικιας, μιμουμενοι την του βασιλεως ωμοτητα. † The Spaniards, in Peru and Mexico, ſeem to have acted on the ſame principle.

of

of Egypt ſhall die. The antients generally ſuppoſed that peſtilence, or any other ſudden mortality, was the immediate infliction of the gods.

Ver. 5. *That ſitteth upon his throne.* הישב על כסאו. The word הישב, or rather הושב with 10 MSS. has been ſuppoſed by ſome interpreters to refer to the firſt-born of Pharaoh, and conſequently rendered "that ſhould have ſitten;" *qui ſeſſurus erat*, or *regni ſucceſſor*, as Dathe renders. They took this from Onkelos and the Thargums. I am perſuaded, however, that Pharaoh himſelf is the antecedent to הושב, juſt as in the next comma השפחה is the antecedent to אשר. It is therefore well rendered by Sep. ὁς καθηται επι του θρονου *; and the whole colon elegantly by Gr. Ven. απο πρωτοτοκου Παραινος, τ καθημενου επι τ θρονου ὁι, μεχρι πρωτοτοκου της θεραπαινιδος, της οπισω τοὺ μυλωνος †.

Ver. 7. *Not a dog ſhall move his tongue.* לא יחרץ כלב לשנו. Although I have followed the common rendering of theſe words, I have ſome doubt of its propriety. The phraſe occurs but three times in the whole Bible; here, Joſh. 10. 21. and Judith, 11. 19. The difficulty chiefly lies in aſcertaining the proper meaning of יחרץ. It is variouſly rendered by the antients.—Sep. γρυξει ‡—Vulg. *mutiet*—Onk. and Tharg. ינזק; rendered in Pol. *lædet*, of the propriety of which I doubt—Syr. נהר, rendered likewiſe *lædit*, but perhaps better *moleſtus erit*.—Saad. ינבח, *latrabit*—Arab. Erp. יעוק, which Michaëlis ſays he does not underſtand; but its ſignification is ſufficiently clear from the Chald. עוק and the Arabic עיק, *vociferari, crocitare, gannire*—Perſ. ננבאנד, *movebit*—Gr. Ven. κινησει; which exactly correſponds with our common verſion.—Let us now ſee what Michaëlis has objected to all theſe verſions. I ſhall abridge his own words: —"Ex duobus quæ Hebraica nobis ſuperſunt locis, adparet, 1. Phraſin de morientibus "poni. 2. Nec ſolum de canibus, ſed de hominibus (Joſh. 10); nec ergo ita explicandam "eſſe, ut quidquam dicat ſolis canibus proprium. 3. לשון non in nominativo ſed adcuſativo "cum חרץ conſtrui .... Jam damnandi videntur, qui aut *latrare* vertunt, aut *mutire*. Mere "conjecturalis eſt, reliquoque Orienti ignota hæc *latrandi* ſive *mutiendi* ſignificatio.—Septua-"ginta ubique γρυξειν vertunt ... et hi malè: primo enim nihil tale habent linguæ Orientis "univerſæ; dein mirum, grunniendi verbo utrobique nomen linguæ addi, qua ne uti quidem "in grunniendo ſolemus.... Ad eos venio qui *lædere* vertunt. *Lædendi*, immo *perdendi*, "ſignificatum verbo non abnegaverim, quem (p. 943) ſub חרץ ſexto pſoui: ſed aliter conſtru-"endum, ut ſana prodeat ſententia, verbum arbitror." Having thus rejected all the antient verſions, he produces his own: "Obſervatum jam (p. 943) חרץ, inter alia, eſſe *cupiditate*, "*amore, ſollicitudine, perire ac perdi*; forte ab urendo et coquendo: jam ergo, de lingua ægroti "aut moribundi poſitum, illam linguæ luxationem, ex ore pendentis, quæ mortem præcedere "ſolet, eſtque in canibus quodammodo propria; rabioſorumque aliquando, ſi nec feſſis nec "ſitientibus lingua propendeat, indicium. Sic erit: *Nemo, ne canis quidem, Iſraelitarum mori-*"*etur*; proprie, morbidam ac tanquam ſitientem ex ore linguam exſeret."—Accordingly he

* So all the editions, but MS. Canon. adds αυτου, agreeably to the Hebrew. † So Caſtalio. "A primo-"genito Pharaonis in ſolio ſedentis, &c." On which he has the following pertinent remark. "In Hebræo ſermone "dubium eſt, utrum Pharao an filius in ſolio ſedere, hoc eſt regnare, aut (ſi de filio) regnaturus eſſe, dicatur. Sed "cum autor Pharaonem ancillis, ſummum infimis opponat, non dubium eſt, quin Pharaonis opus (quod eſt in ſolio "ſedere) ancillarum operi (quod eſt molam trudere) opponat. Adde quod præſens participium, quod *ſedentem* ſonat, "pro *ſeſſurus* non ſatis aptè poneretur." ‡ Some MSS. have βρυξει from βρυχω, *frendo*.

renders

renders in his German Verſion: "Bey den Iſraeliten aber ſoll kein hund krank werden, weder "menſch noch vieh ſoll ſterben"—*But among the Iſraelites no dog ſhall be ſick; neither man nor beaſt ſhall die.* This verſion is adopted by Roſenmüller: but, however ingenious it may appear, I think it cannot bear the teſt of criticiſm. For what ſort of phraſe is this: "Not a dog, "from man to beaſt, ſhall loll his tongue, &c.?" If the Hebrew writer had ſo meant his words to be taken, he would have expreſſed himſelf in another manner. The ſame adverſative particle ל, which is prefixed to בני in the former comma, being prefixed to מאיש in this, ſeems to determine the meaning of the whole colon. But it is urged by Michaëlis, that in Joſhuah the word כלב *dog* is omitted; therefore the phraſe חרץ לשון cannot be reſtricted to dogs, but is applicable alſo to men. It is true, the word כלב is not in the preſent text of Joſhuah, nor indeed in any of the antient verſions: but I am perſuaded that it either originally ſtood in the Text, or was moſt certainly underſtood. Let us here confront the two Hebrew paſſages with the Greek of Judith.

Exod. ולכל בני ישראל ' לא יחרץ כלב לשנו ' למאיש ועד בהמה.

Joſh. לא יחרץ . . . לבני ישראל לאיש את לשנו.

Judith. Ου γρυξει ΚΥΩΝ τη γλωσσῃ αυτου απεναντι σε.

It is clear that, in Joſhuah, a nominative is wanting to יחרץ; and as in the two parallel paſſages כלב, *dog*, is the nominative, it muſt be ſupplied in the Text of Joſhuah. Of this I have no doubt: but I doubt whether יחרץ is well tranſlated, *ſhall move*. After much inveſtigation and reflection, I am almoſt convinced that the primary meaning of חרץ is *acuere, to ſharpen*, and that all its various meanings, in Hebrew at leaſt, may be thence deduced: as I hope to be able to ſhew when I come to remark on the particular paſſages where the word is found. The preſent paſſage then might literally be rendered "not even a dog (the moſt "impudent and audacious of animals) ſhall *whet* his tongue," to *ſnarl*, or *bark*, at the Iſraelites. The Septuagint, then, rendered not ſo badly as Michaëlis would make us believe: indeed they ſeldom render badly: I mean thoſe who tranſlated the Pentateuch; for many of the other Books are badly tranſlated into Greek. The word γρυζω, which they uſe to expreſs חרץ, ſignifies not only to *grunt* as a *hog*, but alſo to *yelp* like a *dog*, or to *mutter* like a *man*; *clamare, muſſitare, gannire, grunnire*, &c. And the verb which the Syr. tranſlator uſes (הר) *ſignifies gannire* more canis, to *bark* like a dog. On the whole; it is better to ſtand to the Antient Verſions than to riſk ſuch a conjecture as that of Michaëlis.—Dathe has given a ſingular paraphraſe: "Apud Iſraelitas vero ne canis quidem latrabit. Nullius, neque hominis, neque ani- "malis, voces audientur." How he could draw this out of the Hebrew, I cannot well comprehend.

CHAP. XII.

Ver. 7. *On the lintel.* על המשקוף. Sep. επι την φλιαν, by Nobilius rendered *ſuper limen* *: but it is doubtful if that be the proper meaning of φλια †.—Aquila has ὑπερθυρον, and Jerom *ſuperliminaribus*; followed by Pagninus, Luther, and almoſt all modern tranſlators.—Onk.

* From Cyprian. † See Conſtantine's *Lexicon*; or Biel's *Theſaurus*. The ſame word is uſed here by Gr. Ven.

and

and Tharg. retain the Hebrew word in a Chaldee form—Syr. has אסכפתא, which I find in no Lexicon; but it is doubtleſs the ſame with the Chald. אסקופא of Pſeudo-Jon. the ק being changed into כ; if it be not a miſprint in the Polyglott: yet I find no various reading in Thorndike's collection.—Saad. אלמטל *the prominence*, that is probably the *lintel*, which projected from the door-head.—Arab. Erp. אלעתבה, which, although rendered by Giggeius *superliminare*, I am apt to think would be better rendered *limen*, the *threſhold*. The Hebrew word itſelf, in its radical ſignification, denotes *looking*, and משקוף may ſignify either *a place to look out at*, or *any thing conſpicuous*. In this latter ſenſe it ſeems to have been taken by Saadias and the Thargumiſts: and its connection with מזוות, *door-poſts*, leads us to think that it was ſomething *prominent* and *conſpicuous* above the door. Yet in 1 Kings, 7. 5. it can hardly have this meaning. See the remark on that place.—If the lintels of the Egyptian houſes projected over the door, like our architraves, they might well be denominated משקופים. I have therefore preferred *lintel* to *threſhold*, and even to *window*: which ſignification, however, משקוף ſeems to have in Kings.

Ver. 8. *With bitter herbs.* על מררים; rendered by Sep. *επι πικριδων*—by Jerom, *cum lactucis agreſtibus*—by Onk. על מררין—by Jonath. על תמבה ועולשין—by Syr. עם מררא—by Saad. מע מראר—by Erp. עלי מראר—by Perſ. אבר תלוחה—Gr. Ven. *επι πικριδων*.—The Sam. verſion retains the pure Hebrew word; which denotes *bitter* herbs of any kind: and moſt of the antient tranſlators keep to that general idea. It is highly probable, however, that the *ſuccory*, or *wild lettuce*, was meant. The Jews of Alexandria, who tranſlated the Pentateuch, could not be ignorant what herbs were eaten with the paſchal lamb in their days. Jerom underſtood the word in the ſame manner: and Pſeudo-Jonathan expreſsly mentions *horehound*, and *lettuces*. —As, however, the word is generic, I would not reſtrict it to one particular meaning; and have, therefore, with Dathe, Michaëlis, and indeed moſt modern interpreters *, tranſlated "*with bitter herbs* †." "Every bitter herb," ſays Jarhi, "is called *meror*: כל עשב מר נקרא מרור; and the Thalmudiſts tell us that the herbs allowed to be eaten with the paſchal lamb are the *lettuce*, חזרת; the *endive*, עולשא; the *horehound*, תמכא; the *charchabina*, חרח בינא; and the *meror*, מרור, which is the Hebrew word in queſtion, and ſuppoſed to denote the *wild lettuce* ‡. See Bochart, *Hieroz.* part i. p. 603. Celſius, *Hierobot.* p. 227. and Buxtorf, *Lexic. Chald.* on the words above-mentioned.—We yet ſadly want a good work on Oriental botany; to which, we hope, ſome of Buonaparte's literary followers will not fail to pay due attention.

Ver. 11. *It is a ſkip-offering to the Lord.* It has been obſerved, that the word *ſkip-offering* has a ludicrous air: and indeed it ſo now appears to myſelf. From the beginning, I felt ſome reluctance in uſing it: but what could I do? I wiſhed to expreſs in Engliſh ſomething like

* Caſtalio alone has *cum cichoreis*. † Some interpreters have imagined that not herbs, but a *bitter* or *ſour* ſauce, like the *εμβαμμα* of the Evangeliſts, in which Jeſus dipped the ſop which he gave to Judas, John, 13. 26. is meant by the Hebrew word; and ſo Luther underſtood and rendered it: "mit bittern ſalſen;" corrected, by Hezel, into "bittern kräutern."—Our Bate ſeems to have been partly of the ſame opinion: "with bitters:" that is (ſays he) either *herbs* or *liquids*—and Coverdale, long before him, rendered *ſour ſauce*. ‡ The Jews at Sanaa, in Yemen, according to Niebuhr and Forſkal, ſtill eat *lettuces* with their paſchal lamb; or, if lettuce cannot be had, *borage*. I doubt not but that, in different countries, they took a ſimilar latitude. In England, and in ſome other northern countries, I am told, *horſe-radiſh* is uſed.

the purport of the original. The word פסח as a verb ſignifies to *leap ſuddenly*, to *ſkip* from place to place, to *hop* like a lame man.—In 1 K. 18. 26. this meaning of *leaping*, or *ſkipping about*, is pretty well aſcertained: the prieſts of Baal are ſaid to have *leaped about his altar*. יפסחו על המזבח. Sep. διεπήδων; Vulg. *tranſiliebant*; Tharg. אשתטו, *they ſkipped like madmen*.—I thought, therefore, that, in Exodus, the word פסח, as a noun, might denote the ſudden manner in which the angel *leaped* or *ſkipped* from every door which he ſaw tinged with the blood of the paſchal lamb; and accordingly I riſked a term which might in ſome degree expreſs that meaning, however ludicrous it might at firſt ſight appear *. It would have been better, perhaps, to retain the Hebrew word, as moſt of the antients and ſeveral moderns have done. Thus Sep. πασχα, throughout the Pentateuch; but in Chron. φασεκ.—Theod. φασεχ.—Onk. פסחא—Syr. פצחא, *Samech* mutato in *tzadé*—Both Arabs פסח—The Vulg. has likewiſe *Phaſe*; but adds, by way of explanation, *id eſt tranſitus*; which he probably had from Aquila, whoſe verſion is ὑπερβασις—Sym. ὑπερμαχησις—Tharg. חיסא—Perſ. שפקת. The two laſt denote *pardon, ſparing mercy*; and indeed the verb פסחתי, in v. 13. is rendered in that ſenſe by Onk. Syr. and both Arabs, as well as by Tharg. and Perſ. Nay the Greek of Sep. σκεπασω, amounts nearly to the ſame meaning.—Jerom alone has *tranſibo*, which accords with the ὑπερβασις of Aquila, and his own *tranſitus*, in ver. 11.—Singular is the verſion of Gr. Ven. ἁλμα εϛι του οντουργου. "It is the *leaping* of the Lord." Hence it is clear that the tranſlator was ſtruck with the ſame idea, which had occurred to me long before I ſaw his verſion, or the obſervation of Jarhi.

Of modern tranſlators, Pagninus contented himſelf with the Hebrew word: Pesach *eſt Domini:* and thoſe who have ſince him tranſlated from the Hebrew have generally followed him. The Tigurines: Pésah *eſt Jehovæ*. Junius: Pascha *eſt Jehovæ*. Luther: *des Herrns* passah. Genevan: *la* pasque *de l'Eternel*. Bruccioli and Diodati: *la* pasca *del Signore* †.—The Roman Catholics who tranſlated from the Latin Vulg. have retained *Phaſe*; but, with Jerom, explain it by *tranſitus—il paſſar—le paſſage—der durchzug—the paſſage*, &c.—I cannot, however, believe that either *paſſage*, or *paſs-over*, expreſſes the meaning of פסח: nor would either of them have ever been thought of but for the words in ver. 12. *I will paſs over*, or rather *paſs through, the land of Egypt*: but here the word is quite different, עברתי, and is properly rendered *tranſibo:* but not ſo פסחתי in ver. 13.—It will be ſaid, perhaps, that to *ſkip over* and to *paſs over* are the ſame. I anſwer, No; any more than *ſkip* and *paſs* are the ſame.—But to ſkip from the ſubject all at once, and to put a ſhort end to the controverſy, let *Phaſah*

* "Oblatio iſta (agni paſchalis) vocatur *Peſach*, propter *ſaltum*, quo Sanctus ille Benedictus tranſibat domos "Iſraelitarum inter domos Ægyptiorum, et *ſaliebat* de Ægyptio in Ægyptium: Iſraelita autem intermedius incolumis "relinquebatur." R. Sol. Jarhi; ex verſione Breithaupti. † Caſtalio and Houbigant are exceptions: they both render *tranſitus:* and all our Engliſh tranſlators, down to Bate, choſe the word *paſs-over*. Bate has, "It is the "halt of Jehovah;" with this curious note: "Not the *paſſing over* or *by* them; but the *halting* or laming of Juſtice. Divine vengeance or puniſhment, ſo low down as the time of Horace, was repreſented by the Romans as lame:—

"Raro antecedentem ſceleſtum
"Deſeruit pede Pœna claudo."

Sid quid hæc ad Iſraelitas?

be

be reſtored in my Verſion throughout the firſt Vol. as it has been done throughout the ſecond; and let the reader affix to it what meaning he pleaſes *.

Ver. 12. *On all the mighty-ones of Egypt.* בכל אלהי מצרים. Literally, *on all the gods of Egypt.* Sep. *εν πασι τοις θεοις των Αιγυπτιων*—Vulg. *in cunctis diis Ægypti:* and ſo equivalently all the Ant. interpreters. I cannot however think, that the word אלהי here ſignifies *gods:* for how could the death of the firſt-born be a puniſhment on the Egyptian divinities? O, yes, ſays Michaëlis, followed by Schulze and Roſenmüller—The Egyptians adored animals; ſuch as the *Bos-Apis* and the *Hircus-Mendes:* if then theſe gods were, at that time, the *firſt-born*, their ſudden death would be a judgment upon them, and Jehovah by that means ſhewed himſelf their ſuperior. But this hypothetical argument has, in my eyes, but little force. *Apis* and *Mendes* were not certainly *all* the deities of Egypt: yet here the Text has בכל אלהי. Is it not much more natural, then, to take אלהי for the great perſonages of Egypt, than for the divinities of Egypt?—So Hiſcuni underſtood the phraſe: "In omnes principes Ægypti—"nam pœna non cadit in res quæ ſpiritu vitæ deſtituuntur." Apud Druſium in loc. †.—The Jewiſh rabbis, however, are in general of a different opinion: and the Thargum makes the Lord ſpeak thus: "Upon all the idols of the Egyptians I will execute four judgments: the "molten idols ſhall be melted, the idols of ſtone ſhall be mutilated, the idols of clay ſhall be "broken in pieces, and the idols of wood ſhall be reduced to aſhes; that the Egyptians may "know that I am the Lord."

Ver. 15. It has been obſerved by Michaëlis, Dathe, and others, that the precept of eating unleavened bread, &c. comes in here awkwardly and out of its place. From ver. 34 and 39 it appears, that it was not a voluntary deed in the Iſraelites to eat their bread unleavened; but that the reaſon why they did ſo was the hurry in which they were "thruſt out of Egypt." This circumſtance then gave riſe to the precept, which could not have been given previouſly to their exit. And indeed it is ſaid, ver. 17. that the Lord had already brought them out of Egypt, at the time when the precept was given: but Moſes, ſay the writers juſt mentioned, would in his narration bring together every precept relative to the paſchal ſolemnity ‡. I would rather ſay, that the hiſtorian here makes the Lord ſpeak alluſively to what was ſoon to

* Perhaps that of *ſparing* is, after all, the moſt probable. So Michaëlis in his German Verſion: "Das Peſach, "oder *Verſchonungsopfer*, das Jehova gebracht wird:" approved of by Schulze, Roſenmüller, and Hezel.—Dathe: *Feſtum hoc eſt libertatis a Jova conceſſæ.* On which he has the following Note: "Triplex eſt explicatio vocabuli פסח. "Alii dicunt eſſe *tranſitum:* quæ quidem ſatis antiqua eſt Joſephi, Philonis, Hieronymi et aliorum ſententia; ſed "parum probabilis: quippe quæ ex linguis cognatis nulla ratione firmari poteſt. Alii *libertatis*, ſive *Lætitiæ*, ſignifica-"tionem ei tribuunt, ex origine Arab. פסח *laxavit*; quod deinde ad utramque illam notionem transfertur—Alii per *parcere* "explicant: quorum ſententia, quod ego quidem ſciam, tantum probatur ex Eſa. 31. 7. ubi quidem contextui ſatis "apta, ſed ut ſit non minus apta altera, *libertatis*, notio: quæ quidem mihi præferenda videtur. Confer quæ pluribus "de hoc vocabulo dicta ſunt ad Glaſſium, p. 968."—He refers to his own edition of Glaſſius. † Houbigant ſaw the impropriety of rendering אלהי *gods*, and would ſubſtitute אהלי *tents*. Accordingly he renders *in omnibus Ægypti habitationibus:* an ingenious conjectural emendation; but, in my opinion, unneceſſary. I doubt if *habitations*, in EGYPT, were ever denominated *tents*. ‡ "Rectè Michaëlis mihi videtur obſervaſſe, hoc præceptum de azymis "a Moſa datum eſſe poſt exitum ex Ægypto. Nam verſu 39. planè apparet, Iſraelitas panem ſuum voluiſſe fermento "miſcere, ſed impeditos fuiſſe ab Ægyptiis. In hujus vero circumſtantiæ memoriam deinde juſſi ſunt veſci azymis. Sed "Moſes hoc loco paſchatos leges conjunctim enarrat: neque in hujus mandati exſecutione apud Iſraelitas ver. 21—27. "aliquid de azymis legitur."—Dathe in locum.

happen: and which, with reſpect to the future keeping of the paſchal ſolemnity, he might properly expreſs in the præterite tenſe. Sep. and Jerom ſolve the difficulty another way; namely, by putting the verb in the future tenſe—εξαξω, *educam.*

Ver. 22. *In a baſon.* בסף. The Hebrew word סף is one of thoſe that have two very different meanings, not eaſily traced to one common root. That it ſignifies *a threſhold* is pretty clear from ſeveral paſſages of Scripture: but that it alſo ſignifies a *baſon, cup,* or ſome ſuch veſſel, is not leſs clear from other paſſages *. But which of theſe meanings has it here? By Sep. it was underſtood in the former ſignification; for, although they have not rendered it by either προθυρον or σταθμος, as they do on ſome other occaſions, they have ſomething nearly equivalent, παρα την θυραν †. Vulg. has expreſsly *in limine.* But all the other antient verſions have words that denote a *baſon* or *vaſe* of ſome kind or other. Onk. במנא—Syr. במאנא—Tharg. במן—Saad. פי אלטשת—Erp. פי אלטסת—Perſ. דר תשת—Gr. Ven. εν τη λεκανη.—I have, therefore, preferred *baſon* to *threſhold* in my Tranſlation; although I confeſs the authority of Sep. and of Jerom has great weight with me, as I have obſerved in my Explanatory Note.

Ver. 29. *It was now midnight, when the Lord ſmote all the firſt-born in the land of Egypt,* &c. The obduracy of Pharaoh muſt at laſt be overcome, and for that purpoſe the ſuperlative plague muſt be introduced. The death of every firſt-born of Egypt in one night; the firſt-born of men, and the firſt-born of beaſts, was a calamity ſufficient to humble the proudeſt tyrant that ever exiſted, and make him conſent to any requeſt that could be made to him. Accordingly we are told, ver. 31, that Pharaoh ſuddenly called for Moſes and Aaron; and bade them be gone from his people, on their own terms.

Such were the famous plagues of Egypt, as they are related by the Hebrew hiſtorian: which narration, with all the concomitant circumſtances, if any unfettered mind can really and literally believe, I will only ſay that it is far, very far, removed from ſcepticiſm.

Is the ſtory then entirely without foundation? Perhaps not. While Moſes and Aaron were ſoliciting the Egyptian king for leave to go with the Iſraelites into the wilderneſs to ſacrifice to their God; but in reality to eſcape altogether from their tyrannical maſters; it might very well happen that an extraordinary exundation of the Nile ſhould take place, and be followed with an uncommon brood of frogs, gnats, and other moſt troubleſome animals; a tremendous hail, a prodigious flight of locuſts, an unuſual darkneſs, and finally a ravaging peſtilence—and all theſe calamities might, in the courſe of nine months or ſo, have ſucceeded one another; and been, in a great meaſure, the conſequences of the firſt calamity, too great an overflow of turbid water: but that thoſe events happened exactly according to the Scripture-relation, it requires great faith, or rather great credulity, to believe.—It will be ſaid, "Is there any thing "here beyond the power of God?"—What is, or what is not, beyond the power of God, I profeſs not to know: his omnipotence is beyond my very limited comprehenſion. The power of God, for ought I know, may be able to convert water into blood, and duſt into flies: but that it did ſo on any particular occaſion, and with circumſtances ſimilar to thoſe which are ſaid to have accompanied the prodigies operated in Egypt by the *rod* or *hand* of Moſes; teſtimo-

* See 2 Sam. 17. 28. 1 Kings, 7. 50. 2 Kings, 12. 13. and Jerem. 52. 19. † The Hebrew word ſometimes denotes not only the *threſhold,* but the *gate* itſelf, and even the adjoining *porch.*

nies

nies beyond all exception, and amounting almoſt to demonſtration, would be required to produce a rational belief. Our faith is always in proportion to the motives of credibility: and, when theſe are weak, our faith muſt neceſſarily be feeble: we cannot believe without conviction, nor diſbelieve with conviction. Now I aſk what motives of credibility have we to believe that the plagues of Egypt were a continued chain of ſupernatural cauſes, operating in the manner related in the Book of Exodus?—Why, becauſe the Book of Exodus is a part of the Hebrew Scriptures, and all that is written in the Hebrew Scriptures is the infallible word of God!—This ſurely is a ſhort and peremptory anſwer: but on what is it founded? On an aſſumed hypotheſis, which has not yet been proved; and which, in my poor apprehenſion, can never be proved.—At any rate, until this proof be brought forward with all the force of convincing evidence, we may, without the merited imputation of impiety or infidelity, doubt of theſe and many other facts contained in the Hebrew Scriptures; and examine into their general veracity or probability, by the ſame rules and criteria with which we examine the writings of other nations. But this ſubject will be treated on more at length in its proper place *.

Ver. 34. *What remained of their yet unleavened dough, wrapt up in cloths.* The original runs thus: ושא העם את בצקו טרם יחמץ משארותם צררת בשמלתם, which in our Vulgar Verſion is rendered: "And the people took their dough before it was leavened, their kneading-troughs "(Margin, or *dough*) being bound up in their clothes."—The difficulty conſiſts in fixing the true meaning of the word משארות. Pagninus, the firſt modern Latin tranſlator, followed Sep. who conſidered משארות here as a term ſynonymous to the preceding בצק: Ανελαβε δε ὁ λαος το ΣΤΑΙΣ αυτων προ του ζυμωθηναι τα ΦΥΡΑΜΑΤΑ αυτων—and ſo, equivalently, Vulg. Syr. Perſ. But Onk. and both Arabs have words which denote kneading-troughs, or at leaſt ſome veſſel for mixing or carrying dough in: and this acceptation has been adopted by moſt modern tranſlators †.—Yet Luther, the Tigurine, Genevan, Le Gros, Michaëlis, and all our earlier Engliſh verſions, follow the Greek and Vulgate; with ſome little variety of expreſſion: and it muſt be confeſſed, that the Septuagint verſion has a great degree of probability. The only objection which can be formed againſt it is, that in ch. 8. 3. the Hebrew word cannot well mean any thing elſe but *kneading-troughs*. Yet there the Septuagint are conſiſtent with themſelves, and render εν τοις φυραμασι. But it is rather ſingular, that, in the only other place where the word occurs, Deut. 8. 5, 17. they render it by εγκαταλειμματα; as Jerom does by *reliquiæ*. Indeed I am much inclined to think that this laſt is its true radical meaning wherever it is found. At any rate, I am convinced that in the preſent paſſage it denotes the *remainder* of the unleavened dough which had not been uſed at the paſchal ſupper: and ſo I find it explained in the Jeruſalem Thargum: מותר פסחיהון קטירין בשושיפהון יהיבין על כתפיהון. This interpretation I have followed in my verſion. It is however but juſt to hear what is ſaid in favour of *kneading-troughs*; which I ſhall give in the words of Harmer, Vol. II. p. 447. "We "are told that the dough which the Iſraelites had prepared for baking was carried away by

* General Preface, Section 3. *On Inſpiration.* † Caſtalio, Junius, Diodati, Spaniſh of Ferrara, Le Clerc, Le Cene, and Hezel, who corrects Luther's verſion, "Zu ihrer *ſpeiſe*," thus: "Beſſer, nach Hebräiſchen, in ihren "*backtrögen*."

"them

" them in their *kneading-troughs*. Now an honeſt thoughtful countryman, who knows how " cumberſome our kneading-troughs are, and how much leſs important than many other uten- " ſils, may be ready to wonder at this . . . But this wonder perhaps may ceaſe when he comes " to underſtand that the veſſels which the Arabs of that country make uſe of for kneading " the unleavened cakes, which they prepare for thoſe who travel in this very deſert, are only " ſmall *wooden bowls* * ; and that they ſeem to uſe no other in their own tents, for that pur- " poſe, or any other ; theſe bowls being uſed by them for kneading their bread, and after- " wards ſerving up their proviſions when cooked † : for then it will appear, that nothing could " be more convenient than kneading-troughs of this kind for the Iſraelites in their journey. " —I am, however," adds he, " a little doubtful, whether theſe were the things that Moſes " meant by that word, which our Verſion renders *kneading-troughs* ; ſince it ſeems to me that " the Iſraelites had made a proviſion of corn ſufficient for their conſumption for about a " month, and that they were preparing to bake *all* this at once ‡. Now their own little " wooden bowls, in which they were wont to knead the bread they wanted for a ſingle day, " could not contain all this dough, nor could they well carry a number of theſe things, bor- " rowed of the Egyptians for the preſent occaſion, with them. . . . They could not then well " carry ſuch a quantity of dough in thoſe wooden bowls, which they uſed for kneading their " bread in common. What is more : Dr. Pococke tells us, that the Arabs actually carry their " dough in *ſomething elſe* : for after having ſpoken of their copper diſhes, put one within ano- " ther, and their wooden bowls, in which they make their bread . . . he gives us a deſcription " of a *round leather coverlid*, which they lay on the ground, and [which] ſerves them to eat " off ; which, he ſays, has rings round it, by which it is drawn together with a chain, that " has a hook to hang it by. This is drawn together, and ſometimes they carry in it their *meal* " *made into dough* ; and in this manner they bring it full of bread ; and, when the repaſt is " over, carry it away at once with *all that is left* ‖.—Whether *this utenſil* is rather to be under- " ſtood by the word tranſlated *kneading-trough* than the Arab *wooden bowl*, I leave my reader " to determine. I would only remark, that there is nothing in the other three places in " which the word occurs to contradict this explanation."—Whether Bate took this idea from Harmer, I know not ; but he renders in his Verſion " their leavening-bags," and has this Note upon it : " Leaven is ſour dough, which raiſes a ferment in ſweet dough : we commonly " uſe yeaſt for this purpoſe ; but in countries where they do not brew, they uſe leaven ; and " in the Eaſt they have leathern bags, in which they carry their dough on a journey while it is " fermenting."

* Such wooden bowls, called *boſſies*, or *baſſies*, were, when I was a boy, almoſt univerſally uſed for the ſame purpoſe, by the poorer ſort of people, in the more northern parts of Scotland ; and were often carried about from place to place by the Highland *Bedouins*. Neither leaven nor yeaſt was ſought on ſuch occaſions. The meal was tempered with water, and immediately kneaded into hearth-cakes. † The Scotch *baſſies* often paid the ſame double debt.
‡ This is a mere ſuppoſition, unwarranted by the Text. ‖ This very naturally leads to the meaning which I have given to משארות ; and is at the ſame time a genuine picture of a Scottiſh *meal-poke*, which contained not only the meal, but the uneaten bread, and the diſh in which it was kneaded.—The phraſe is, *poke*, or rather *pock*, *up the leavings* : המשארות.

Roſenmüller

Roſenmüller has no doubt that משארות denotes the ſmall wooden platters or bowls mentioned by Shaw, and alluded to above *.

Ib. *Wrapped up in cloths upon their ſhoulders.* The cloth in which the proviſion-bag was carried ſeems to have been a long mantle correſponding with the Grecian πεπλος, and the Roman *toga:* which is thus deſcribed by Iſidore of Seville: "TOGA dicta, quod velamento "ſui corpus tegat atque operiat. Eſt autem pallium purum, forma rotunda et fuſiore, et "quaſi inundante ſinu, et *ſub dextra veniens,* ſuper *humerum ſiniſtrum ponitur.* Menſura togæ "juſta, ſi ſex ulnas habeat †." Perhaps a better deſcription could not be given of the Scottiſh *plaid* ‡, which was worn in the ſame manner. After paſſing round the body under *the right arm,* it was doubled and thrown over the left ſhoulder; and in the fold which hung over the back I have ſeen conſiderable burthens carried, particularly of eatables. At night the wearer ſlept in it, wrapped round his head.—The long mantle of the Spaniards is a garment of the ſame kind; which they probably had from the Moors: at leaſt ſuch a mantle is deſcribed by Shaw as common in Barbary.

Ver. 36. *Thus they ſpoiled the Egyptians.* ונצלו את מצרים. See what has been ſaid on ch. 3. 21. Juſti § and ſome others think that the Egyptians received in pledge for the things borrowed from them by the Iſraelites the poſſeſſions of the latter, which they could not take along with them. "Sed hoc non veriſimile eſt," ſays Roſenmüller; "Iſraelitæ enim, quum "Nomades eſſent, nec agriculturæ dediti, nullos alios fundos poſſidebant, quam bucalia illa "in terra Goſen. Hæc vero ipſi non emerant, ſed conceſſa tantum eis erant a rege: ad hunc "ergo illa rurſus redibant, Iſraelitis ea relinquentibus. Pecora autem, præcipuas Nomadum "opes, Iſraelitæ ſecum duxerunt, ut infra ver. 38. diſertè dicitur." But is Roſenmüller's own interpretation better founded? "Hac igitur ratione *Ægyptios ſpoliaverunt:* acceperunt ab "eis res illas quas rogaverant"—They *received* from them the things which they had *aſked!*—This, to be ſure, is a new and eaſy way of *ſpoliating.* But the Hebrew word נצל every where ſignifies *to ſpoil* one againſt his inclination: nor can a perſon be ſaid to be *ſpoiled* who beſtows a gift. In ſhort, it is clear, to me, that the Iſraelites aſked and borrowed what they never meant to repay.

Ver. 37. *From Rameſes.* This is one of thoſe cities which the Iſraelites in ch. 1. 11. are ſaid to have built for Pharaoh. It was probably in the land of Goſhen, with which it is ſometimes alternated ||. Compare Gen. 46. 28. and 47. 11. 27. It ſeems to have been the place of general rendezvous of the Iſraelites before their departure. Niebuhr thinks it may have been Heliopolis, the reſidence of the Egyptian kings. But *Heliopolis,* or *On,* is mentioned c. 1. 11.

* "Proprie ſunt vaſa in quibus maſſa farinæ ferveſcit, a שאר, Arab סאר, *ferbuit:* inde plerique interpretum verterunt "*mactræ* (backtröge). Hæ vero in tam longo itinere ſane valde incommodæ fuiſſent ad portandum, quod factum eſſe "tamen ſtatim dicitur. Igitur ſine dubio intelligendæ ſunt *patellæ lignea,* in quibus etiamnum Arabes placentas ſuas "infermentatas depſere, et coctas in itinere ſecum gerere ſolent." † Originum lib. ix. c. 24. ‡ The antient Scottiſh name is *feik,* the very term by which the African Arabs expreſs it, namely *hyk* or *heik.* The change of the aſpirate *h* into *f* was common among the northern nations, in borrowing words from the Oriental dialects. The Romans made the ſame mutation, in borrowing words from the Greeks. § *Ueber die den Aegyptern von den Iſraeliten bey ihrer Abreiſe abgefoderten Gerathe.* Apud Roſenmüller in loc. || In Gen. 46. 28. where the Hebrew has גשנה, *to Goſhen,* the Septuagint render εις γην Ραμεσση, *in the land of Rameſes.* Rameſes then muſt have either been another name for Goſhen, or a principal part of it. I think it was its chief, perhaps its only, city.

by

by Sep. at leaſt, as a different town from *Rameſes*.—His opinion that it was not far from Heliopolis is much more probable. "Not far from the ruins of Heliopolis," ſays he, "and nearly "north-eaſt, is to be ſeen at this day a great heap of ruins, called *Tel-elihud*, or *Turbet-el-*"*Ihud*."—The Arabic tranſlator Saadias took it to be the ſame with Heliopolis; as he renders עין אלשמס.—All the other verſions retain the Hebrew word רמסס, ſave Tharg. which has פלוסין *Peluſium*.

Ib. *To Succoth*. סכתה. More properly written סוכותה, as it is in one of Ken. MSS. *—Sep. εις Σοκχωθ—Vulg. *in Socoth* †. It ſeems to have been ſo called from its being a place where temporary booths, or tents, were erected for the convenience of the caravans; hence it is well rendered by Saadias אלעריש *Alariſh*; and by Gr. Ven. Καλυβας. Comp. Gen. 33. 17. —Or, perhaps, it was ſo named from booths, *mapalia*, erected there, originally by the Nomadical ſhepherds, for the tending of their flocks and herds, or for the ſhearing of their ſheep. Joſephus mentions neither *Rameſes* nor *Sochoth:* but only ſays that the Iſraelites took their journey by Letopolis, which was then a deſert: and that, after the devaſtation of Egypt by Cambyſes, Babylon was built on the ſame ſite ‡. Some, however, have imagined that Joſephus, by *Letopolis*, deſigns to mark not *Sochoth* but *Etham*; and this, for aught that appears from his context, may poſſibly be the caſe. But ſee Bernard's Note on Joſephus, Ant. p. 111. ed. Havercamp.—It is not at all improbable that the *Sucha* of Pliny § is the *Sochoth* of Exodus.

Ib. *About ſix hundred thouſand*, &c. This is truly a very great number, ſprung from 72 or 75 perſons, in the courſe of even 430 years ‖: but if the period be reduced to 212, as it is in Joſephus, and which I believe to be a juſt calculation, the number 600,000 is, I will not ſay hardly credible, but hardly poſſible. Let us ſee how the caſe ſtands. The preſent Hebrew Text ſays, that "the ſojournment, which the children of Iſrael had made in the land of Egypt, "was 430 years." But the Sam. Text, and Verſion, and the Septuagint Tranſlation, have "The ſojournment which the children of Iſrael and their foreſathers had made in the land of "Chanaan, and in the land of Egypt, was 430 years."—Which is to be believed? The Hebrew Text, ſay the ſticklers for it.—Why? Becauſe it is the genuine Text of the Pentateuch, which was corrupted by the Septuagint and the Samaritans.—Where are the proofs of that corruption? Joſephus has the ſame number, ſpeaking expreſsly and minutely on the event: "They left Egypt," ſays he, "in the month Xanthicus, on the 15th day of the moon, in the "430th year after the coming of our father Abraham into Chanaan, and in the 215th year "after the migration of Jacob into Egypt."—Yes, but Joſephus has been adjuſted to the Septuagint ¶. By whom? when? and how?—We cannot tell, but ſo we will have it in compliment to the Hebrew Text ¶!—But Paul, the inſpired Paul, coincides with Joſephus and the Septuagint,

* Two MSS. with Sam. have סכותה, which Onk. Syr. Tharg. Perſ. Arab. Erp. muſt have read in their copies: ſo that the punctuiſts have here ejected one *vau* at leaſt, if not two; to make place for their *cholem* and *kibbutz*. † This orthography, or rather *Sochoth*, I ſhould have followed in my Verſion. ‡ Την δε πορειαν εποιουντο κατα Λητους-πολιν, ερημον ουσαν εν τοις τοτε. Βαβυλων γαρ ὑς-ερον κτισεται εκει, Καμβυσου κατας-ρεφομενου την Αιγυπτον.—The ſame hiſtorian tells us that the Egyptians ſhed *penitential tears* at the departure of the Iſraelites, for having ſo ill treated them. Κλαιοντων και μετανοουντων, ὁτι χρησαιντο χαλεπως αυτοις, των Αιγυπτιων. In which of his *ſacred* books did he find this? § L. vii. c. 13. ‖ I count from the birth of Reuben. ¶ That there is no appearance of interpolation, or alteration, in the Text of Joſephus, I appeal to every reader who underſtands Greek: Κατελιπον

tuagint, when in his Epiſtle to the Galatians he ſays that "the Law was given 430 years after "the promiſe to Abraham."—True; but Paul might, in *this*, miſtake, and be miſled by the Septuagint. I readily grant that Paul might miſtake, and be miſled by the Septuagint: but there is no ſhadow of proof that he was here miſled. The calculation of the Septuagint muſt have been then believed by the Jews in general: which is barely poſſible if their Hebrew copies were in oppoſition to it. Paul had been inſtructed at the feet of Gamaliel, and could not be ignorant of the opinion of the Jewiſh people about the ſupputation of time.

But what need is there of external teſtimony to ſupport the authority of Sam. and Sep. where there is ſo ſtrong a chain of internal evidence?—Take any of the patriarchal genealogies, (ſuppoſe that of Judah,) from Jacob's entrance into Egypt to the departure of the Iſraelites thence, and ſee if a ſpace of 430 years could be included. We ſhall ſuppoſe that Hezron, the ſon of Pharez, was but an infant when he went with his father into Egypt; and that he begot Aram, or Ram, at the age of forty, which is perhaps too much *; and that Aram begot Aminadab at a ſimilar period, and Aminadab Nahaſhon; and that Nahaſhon was in the prime of life when, Num. 1. 7. in the ſecond year of the Exodus, he was named the chief of the tribe of Judah—ſuppoſe him ſeventy-five—the whole will amount to the ſum of Sam. Sep. and Joſephus; namely, 215.—But what ſort of genealogical tiſſue muſt be ſuppoſed to produce the other number, 430? Why, Hezron muſt beget Aram, Aram Aminadab, and Aminadab Nahaſhon, each at a medium of one hundred years of age; and Nahaſhon, when appointed chief of the Judahites, muſt have been one hundred and thirty!

Let us take another genealogy from Levi. His ſon Kohath ſhall likewiſe be ſuppoſed an infant when he came with his father into Egypt; and that he begot Amram, and Amram Aaron, each at the age of forty, nay fifty; and that Aaron at the time of the Exodus was eighty-three years old, being three years older than Moſes; the ſum total, ſo far from amounting to 430, will not come to the one-half.—I can ſee only one anſwer that can be oppoſed to theſe genealogies; namely, that ſome names may have been omitted: but is not this begging the queſtion? although I confeſs the poſſibility of ſuch omiſſions; yea, that ſuch omiſſions have been ſometimes made: but it is much leſs likely that they would be made in the genealogies of the tribes of Judah and Levi, eſpecially in thoſe of the royal and ſacerdotal lines.

There is, however, one paſſage in Gen. 15. 13. which apparently militates againſt the ſmaller number 215. It is this: "Know thou for certain (ſaid the Lord to Abraham) that "thy ſeed ſhall be ſojourners in a land not their own, *the inhabitants of* which will reduce "them to ſlavery, and will afflict them, for four hundred years." Here there is no variety in the Sam. or Sep. and the 400 years are taken, as a round number, for 430. That ſuch round

Κατελιπον δε την Αιγυπτον μηνι Ξανθικῳ, πεμπτῃ και δεκατῃ κατα σεληνην· μετα ετη τριακοντα και τετρακοσια η τον προγονον ἡμων Αβραμον εις την Χαναναιαν ελθειν· της δε Ιακωβου μεταναστασεως εις την Αιγυπτον γενομενης διακοσιοις προς τοις δεκαπεντε ενιαυτοις ὑστερον.—Would any *adjuſter* to the Septuagint have thought of adding the laſt comma? I think not. * We are told in 1 Chron. 2. 21. that he married a ſecond wife, a daughter of Machir, when he was ſixty years old; which is noted rather as a ſingularity. He had had three ſons by a former marriage. Ibid. ver. 9. We find that the patriarchs married rather late in life, comparatively ſpeaking: Iſaac at the age of forty, Jacob at eighty-one, Joſeph at thirty. Judah however married about twenty; and Benjamin ſeems to have married much ſooner: a medium of forty years then may be well taken for the birth of Aram, who appears to have been the ſecond ſon of Pharez. See 1 Chron. 2. 9.

numbers are ſometimes uſed in Scripture computation is certain, and I believe it is ſo here: but I believe that the 400, i. e. the 430, years are to be ſupputed from the period when this declaration is ſuppoſed to have been made to Abraham; and not from the ingreſs of Jacob into Egypt. God ſeems to ſay: "It will be yet four full centuries before the afflictions of thy "poſterity ſhall be at an end:" and in this ſenſe the words are taken by the beſt Jewiſh interpreters. I ſhall quote only S. Jarhi, ſo much the rather as he ſtrengthens his argument ſomewhat in the manner which I have done, by a genealogical computation. "Habitatio "qua habitarunt in Ægypto, *viz.* poſt cæteras habitationes, quibus Iſraelitæ commorati ſunt "peregrini *in terra non ſua, fuit* 430 *annorum.* Omne intermedium tempus ex quo natus eſt "Iſaacus, uſque ad hoc tempus fuit quadringinta annorum: [nam] ex quo ſemen fuit Abra-"hamo, impletum eſt [vaticinium illud] *quia peregrinum erit ſemen tuum.* Triginta autem "anni præterierant ex quo factum erat decretum inter diviſiones" (he means the divided parts of the victims) "uſque ad nativitatem Iſaaci. Nec dici poteſt (quod commoratio iſta 430 "annorum fuerit) in ſola terra Ægypti: nam ecce Kahat [Kohath] ex illis fuit, qui cum "Jacobo venerant: jam vero omnes ejus annos numera, ut et annos omnes Amrami, ejus "filii; præterea etiam 80 annos Moſis; non reperies eos tantam efficere ſummam, ac vel te "invito multi fuerunt anni Kahato, priuſquam ille deſcenderat in Ægyptum, multi quoque ex "annis Amrami intercedunt in annis Kahati, ut et multi de 80 (annis) Moſis abſorbentur in "annis Amrami—ecce non reperies 400 annos, poſtquam Iſraelitæ in Ægyptum venerunt; "quapropter neceſſario vel invitus dicere debes, quod etiam cæteræ מושבות, i. e. *commora-"tiones* vocentur גרות, i. e. *incolatus*; etiam illa commoratio quæ fuit in Hebron: dicitur "enim, ubi גר, i. e. *peregrinatus erat* Abraham et Iſaac. Dicit etiam Scriptura terra מגוריהם, "i. e. *peregrinationes eorum*, in qua peregrinati ſunt; quamobrem te dicere oportet (quod "verba illa) *quia* גר *erit ſemen tuum* (intelligenda ſunt de eo tempore,) ex quo ei (Abrahamo) "fuit ſemen; ac quando numerabis quadringentos annos, poſtquam natus eſt Iſaacus, depre-"hendes, quod ab adventu eorum (Iſraelitarum) in terram Ægypti, uſque ad eorundem egreſ-"ſum, fuerit 210 * annorum tempus." Jarhi ex Verſ. Breithaupt.

If all the Jewiſh commentators reaſoned in this manner, their comments would be much more valuable than they are. To do juſtice to a learned Jew of our own time and country, I cannot help adding the ſenſible note of Delgado. "The period from which to begin theſe "430 years, we find, muſt be from Abraham's ſetting out from Ur-Chaſdim, he being then "ſeventy years old; which was thirty years before the birth of Iſaac; and from which time it "may be ſaid that he lived under the ſpecial protection of God in a land that was not his own. "... Now thirty years before the birth of Iſaac, ſixty of Iſaac before the birth of Jacob, one "hundred and thirty of Jacob when he went down into Egypt, and two hundred and ten of "their ſtay in Egypt, make up the 430 years here mentioned." Hence he corrects our vulgar verſion thus: ("*Now the ſpace of time* of the *dwelling* of the children of Iſrael, which "*they* dwelt in Egypt *(and in a land which was not theirs,)* was four hundred and thirty years.") This is at leaſt an ingenious attempt to reconcile the Text with reaſon and chronology: but it is more ſpecious than ſolid: for if the whole time from the vocation of Abraham to the Exodus

* This is five years leſs than the computation of Joſephus.

be

be included in the 430 years, the *children of Iſrael* cannot be ſaid to have dwelled all that time in *Egypt* or in *any other country, not their own.* Therefore the addition in Sam. and Sep.* is abſolutely neceſſary to make ſenſe of the verſe, in the ſuppoſition that the peregrinations of Abraham, Iſaac and Jacob are included in the 430 years.

To overturn the expreſs teſtimony of Joſephus, two other paſſages are produced from his works: namely, Antiq. lib. ii. c. 9. n. 1. and De Bello Jud. lib. v. c. 9. n. 4.—In the former place Joſephus ſays that the Iſraelites were afflicted by the Egyptians 400 years, τετρακοσιων μεν ετων χρονον. True: nor will I ſay with Bochart †, that Joſephus has been here interpolated: but the words of Joſephus, both here and in his Jewiſh War, muſt be explained like the fore-mentioned paſſage of Geneſis, to which he no doubt alludes.

The celebrated Michaëlis has, in the 12th tome of his Oriental Library ‡, laboured to prove that the Iſraelites actually remained in Egypt 430 years, and that the Sam. Text and the Septuagint Verſions are here to be diſregarded; and that the ſum of years in the Hebrew Text is the ſpace of time which the children of Iſrael actually paſſed in Egypt. He thought otherwiſe when he gave the firſt edition of his German Verſion of the Bible; but changed his mind before he gave the ſecond. His reaſons, although generally acceded to by his countrymen §, are in my opinion far from being convincing. The chief one is the improbability of ſo prodigious an increaſe in population during ſo ſhort a period as 215 years. "Denique," ſays Roſenmüller, "ſi Iſraelitarum in Ægypto habitatio tantum 215 annos comprehendiſſe "exiſtimatur, *nullo modo* intelligi poteſt, quomodo ii tam brevi temporis ſpatio ad tantum "numerum creſcere potuiſſent." Aye, there's the rub: a ſpace of time is wanted to make an army of 600,000 men ſpring from twelve perſons. If to this number be added the women, and the children under twenty years of age, the number will be great indeed! But, in the firſt place, it is not neceſſary to ſuppoſe that all thoſe full-grown men were the progeny of Jacob. Abraham could arm "three hundred and eighteen" of his own domeſtics ‖, and Eſau met his brother with "four hundred men ¶." When the two ſons of Jacob, Simeon and Levi, ſlew the Sichemites, we are not to ſuppoſe that they were without a number of armed attendants: and when Jacob went down into Egypt we may readily conceive that a very numerous body of domeſtics accompanied him and his ſons. Each of the patriarchs had doubtleſs his own retinue: and if each of theſe were but nearly in proportion to the domeſtics of Abraham, their progeny would, in the courſe of 215 years, amount to a very great number. —In the ſecond place, it appears certain that the Iſraelites were a very prolific nation. At the

* That the genuine reading of Sep. was eſſentially the ſame with Sam. is clear; although there is ſome variety of reading in the copies. The words αυτοι και πατερες αυτων are wanting in the Rom. edition: but as it has και εν γη Χανααν, the omiſſion is to be charged to the tranſcriber of the Vat. MS. For all the other editions with Copt. and the old Italic have the words wanting in Rom. either immediately after κατωκησαν, as Comp. or after Χανααν as Ald. Alex. with Copt. and Ital. apud Auguſtinum.—The Oxford MS. the uncial Ambroſian, and that of Canonici, agree with Compl. which follows the arrangement of the Sam. Text. This reading will moſt probably be confirmed by many of Dr. Holmes's MSS. † "Scripſerat Joſephus και πολλων ετων χρονον; ſemidoctus autem aliquis oræ codicis "appoſuit τετρακοσιον, quæ vox poſtea in textum irrepſerit."—"Sed procul dubio," ſays Hudſon, "reſpexit vetus "illud oraculum Abramo datum, Gen. 15. 13." ‡ See alſo Koppe's Programma Paſchale. Goettingen, 1777. § Hezel, however, well ſupports the contrary opinion; and adopts the Sam. and Septuagint reading. ‖ Gen. 14. 14. ¶ Gen. 22. 6.

ſiege of Jeruſalem by Titus Veſpaſian the number of killed, famiſhed, and captived, in Joſephus, is almoſt inconceivable.—Add to this, that the ſoil of Egypt was always deemed extremely favourable to fecundity. Twins at a birth were common; nor were three, or even more, conſidered as a rarity: "Trigeminos naſci certum eſt, Horatiorum Curiatiorumque "exemplo: ſupra, inter *oſtenta* ducitur, præterquam in Ægypto *."—Finally, the Iſraelites were polygamiſts: and there is little doubt that polygamy, in ſome countries, and circumſtances, contributes to population.—I mention not circumciſion as a cauſe of prolification, becauſe I doubt of its efficacy; although Philo aſſerts that thoſe nations where circumciſion prevails are more populous than others †.

If all theſe cauſes ſeem ſtill inadequate to the number of Iſraelites, and their retainers, who went out of Egypt under the conduct of Moſes, I ſee no remedy but to allow that the number has been exaggerated here, as well as in many other places, by the Hebrew hiſtorian who compiled the Pentateuch. Indeed it is hard to conceive how ſuch a multitude could have reſided in the land of Goſhen, or even in the whole of inferior Egypt, without overſtocking the country, even had there been no Egyptians among them; which certainly was not the caſe. The intelligent reader will believe what he pleaſes of the matter: but I am apt to think the number has been exaggerated: as I ſhall have occaſion to obſerve hereafter in more than one place.

Ver. 42. *Hence that night is . . . to be kept a vigil to the Lord.* ליל שמרים הוא ליהוה. *Nox obſervationum iſta Domino.* The Septuagint ſeem to have divided otherwiſe; making ליל the end of ver. 41. εξηλθε πασα ἡ δυναμις Κυριου εκ γης Αιγυπτου, νυκτος. Προφυλακη εϛι τῳ Κυριῳ. κ. τ. λ: So Ald. Vat. Alex. and Glaſg. with Copt. and Ital. But Compl. divides after Αιγυπτου, and has Νυξ προφυλακης: which reading perhaps will be found in ſome of Holmes's MSS.—Aq. Νυξ παρατηρησεων—Sym. Νυξ παρατετηρημενη—Schol. Samar. Νυξ φυλαξεως; and ſo, equivalently, all the other Ant. Verſions. Perhaps the right reading of Sep. is Νυκτος (not νυκτι, as in Montfaucon) προφυλακη εϛι τῳ Κυριῳ. *It is a watch of the night; or a night-watch to the Lord.*—Delgado, I know not on what authority, gives the phraſe another turn: "This night "the Lord kept watch to bring them forth, &c." How the Hebrew can bear this meaning I cannot conceive.—The whole verſe is well paraphraſed by Dathe: "Illa nox, qua ſingulari Dei "cura ex Ægypto eductj ſunt, ſacra eſſe debet Jovæ, ſumma cum cura peragenda ab Iſraelitis "eorumque poſteris."—And elegantly by Luther: "Darum wird dieſe nacht dem Herrn "gehalten, daſs er ſie aus Egyptenland geführet hat: und die kinder Iſrael ſollen ſie dem "Herrn halten, ſie und ihre nachkommen."

Ver. 46. In this verſe there is in ſome copies of Sep. an addition which I have marked among the Various Readings; and which is by moſt modern critics deemed an interpolation from ver. 10. But I, who am more inclined to admit *omiſſions* than *interpolations*, have not much doubt that it made a part of the original text. It is in Ald. Alex. Glaſg. and in the old Coptic Verſion; and in P. P. ch. 34. 25.—However, as it is wanting in Compl. Vat. and perhaps in other copies; and as it ſeems not to have been read by the Latin Fathers in the Italic; I have rejected it from the Text as at leaſt a dubious reading.

* Plin. lib. vii. c. 3. Ariſtotle and Seneca bear witneſs to the ſame purport. They all aſcribe this fecundity to the waters of the Nile. † De Circumciſione.

CHAP.

CHAP. XIII.

Ver. 4. *Let nothing leavened be eaten.* ולא יאכל חמץ. The copulative is wanting in four MSS. and Sam. has it before אתם in the next verſe. This I take to be the true reading; and think that לא יאכל חמץ, which in our common diviſion makes a part of ver. 3. belongs to ver. 4. I have rendered accordingly, as Syr. had done before me.

Ver. 9. *Let this rite be to you as a token upon your hands, and as a memorial between your eyes,* &c. Is this a mere metaphorical expreſſion, or a literal injunction?—The Jewiſh commentators are generally of opinion that the words of the precept concerning the ſanctification of the firſt-born were to be written on ſhreds of linen or parchment, and worn on their wriſts and foreheads. So the Thargums, followed by the Thalmudiſts, Raſhi, Jarhi, &c.: but there appears no veſtige of this practice before the Babyloniſh captivity; and it is not improbable that the Jews at that period borrowed the practice from the Babylonians and Perſians, who wore various kinds of taliſmans againſt incantations; and inſcribed marks on their arms with the aſhes of an herb called *alhenna*. Or, if ſuch a practice prevailed among the nations in the time of Moſes, he meant to ſanctify and purge it from impurity, by applying it to the worſhip of Jehovah; and enjoining its uſe not as an enchantment, but a mere remembrancer of the tranſaction alluded to.—But it is alſo probable that the precept is only figurative, implying that the remembrance of God's goodneſs to them ſhould never be out of their ſight. "Externæ "iſtæ ceremoniæ ſint tibi non ſecus ac ſi quis aliquod ſignum habeat in manu, aut monu-"mentum ante oculos ſuos, quod eum perpetuo admoneat beneficii accepti." Vatable.—It is obſervable that the Caraite Jews admit of no ſuch practice; and call their Maſoretical brethren *bridled aſſes*, on account of their תפלין, or *phylacteries* *: for an account of which ſee Calmet's Dictionary, or Buxtorf's Lexic. Chald. under the root פלל.

Ver. 16. This is a repetition of a part of ver. 9. but with this difference, that what is called there זכרון is here called טוטפות; which ſeems to favour the opinion that the precept was ſomewhat more than figurative. The word is found only here, and twice in Deuteron. and its literal meaning is very uncertain. By Sep. it is uniformly rendered ασαλευτον †, *immoveable*. By Jerom, *penſum quid* ‡. Onk. and Tharg. תפלין, *phylacteries*. Both Arabs, מנשורה, which why Michaëlis renders *amuletum* I know not. Better *expanſum*, in Caſtell and the Polyglott. Perſ. תפלין, the Chaldee word. The Samaritan verſion has טפין, not תפים, (as Michaëlis writes it,) rightly derived by Caſtell from טפא, which in the Syr. dialect ſignifies *adheſion*; and this falls in with the verſion of Sep. and Aquila. Gr. Ven. προμετωπιδα, *a frontlet*.

With reſpect to the derivation of the word טוטפות, טטפות, טוטפת, or טטפת, (for in all theſe forms we find it written,) our Lexicographers are not agreed. The greater part make טטף the root; but this etymon is hardly admiſſible. Much more probable is that of Michaëlis, who derives it from טפף *ligare*, or from טוף *circumire*. But even theſe derivations are queſtion-

* That ſuch phylacteries were worn by the Jews in the time of our Lord JESUS, is clear from Matt. 23. 5. where he blames not the Scribes and Phariſees for uſing them; but for their affectation in making them uncommonly broad: πλατυνουσι δε φυλακτηρια αυτων. † So likewiſe Sym. and Theod.—Aquila: ατιναχτα. See Montfaucon.
‡ To which, by way of explanation, he adds *ob recordationem*.

able;

able *; and טוטפות may be ſome compoſite foreign word, which we vainly trace to an Hebrew root.—On the whole, as it is difficult to aſcertain its genuine proper meaning, I have, with the Syriac tranſlator, kept to a general term; and rendered, as in ver. 9, *a memorial.*

Ver. 17. This verſe contains a ſtrange aſſertion; namely, That God would not lead the Iſraelites into Chanaan by the way of the Philiſtines, leſt, *on their ſeeing war, they* might *repent, and return into Egypt.*—What! The God who, in the dead of one night, had deſtroyed all the firſt-born in the land of Egypt, and was juſt about to deſtroy the whole Egyptian army in their paſſage through the Red-ſea, was afraid, with a hoſt of 600,000 men, to lead them the higheſt road to the land which he had promiſed to give them!—This paſſage alone has long appeared to me a very ſtrong preſumption that God had no immediate hand in the matter. We ſee all the precaution of a wiſe and provident leader; who was afraid that his people, however numerous, ſo little accuſtomed to the uſe of arms, and ſo long debaſed with unnerving ſervitude, would not be able to face a warlike foe, at their firſt exit from that ſtate: it was therefore neceſſary to inure them gradually to warlike exerciſes, and to train them up to military diſcipline, before he ventured to expoſe them to the perils of battle: and this was, no doubt, the cauſe why he fled from the Egyptians who purſued him, inſtead of facing about upon them, and fighting them. For, had God been pleaſed to interfere, it would have been as eaſy for him to have ſwallowed up the Egyptians in the ſands as in the ſea; or, without any intermediate terreſtrial agent, ſent his deſtroying angel among them, to extirpate them in a moment. —Whoever will be at the trouble to read this paſſage without theological prepoſſeſſion, and compare it with a number of other ſimilar paſſages, where events, according to the Oriental idioms, are immediately aſcribed to the Deity, which were or might be the works of nature, or human deſign, will, I think, be apt to allow that there is nothing ſupernatural, or divine, in the manner in which Moſes conducted the children of Iſrael out of the land of Egypt.—But this, I truſt, will appear ſtill more clearly as we proceed.

Ver. 18. *In battle-array.* The Heb. word is חמשים, by Pagninus rendered *accinĕti;* and by our laſt Engliſh tranſlators *harneſſed* †—Bate, *marching in array*—Purver, *in military order*; adopted by Biſhop Law, in his MS. Notes: and ſo equivalently moſt foreign modern interpreters; as well as all the antient tranſlators ‡, ſave Sep. Theod. and Jonathan; the firſt of whom has πεμπτῃ γενεᾷ, *in the fifth generation;* the ſecond πεμπταιζοντες, and the laſt חד עם חמשא טפלין, *each with five little ones:* a moſt abſurd interpretation.

Let us try to fix the meaning. It is certain that the radical word חמש ſignifies *five,* and that חמשים ſignifies *fifty.* But is חמשים the true reading? It is the reading of the preſent printed Text and of three Sam. MSS. On the other hand, the Sam. printed Text and one Heb. MS. have חמישים; and four Heb. MSS. have חמושים: and this laſt is the real reading of the printed Text, which ſupplies the place of *vau* with a *kibbutz* §.

* See Crit. Rem. on Iſaiah, 3. 16. on the word תפוח. † Margin. *By five in a rank.* ‡ Aquila, ενοπλισαμενοι, or rather ενωπλισμενοι—Sym. καθωπλισμενοι—Vulg. *armati*—Onk. מזרזין—Syr. מזינין—Saad. מתעבין—Erp. זדזין—Perſ. אמדנד—Gr. Ven. ὡπλημενοι, if it be not an error of the preſs for ὡπλισμενοι. § In three other places; namely, Joſh. 1. 14—4. 12. and Jud. 7. 11. the word in the Text is written and pointed in the ſame manner: but in the firſt place 4 MSS. in the ſecond 9, and in the third 1, have חמושים full. De Roſſi takes no notice of the variety: ſo we know not how his MSS. read. He has in general been far too ſparing of his readings.

Michaëlis

Michaëlis adopts the Sam. reading חמשים, and contends that the word ſhould be rendered *quinquageni*; *in bands of fifty*. "Nempe, ut Romani militem in *centurias* diſpertiebantur, ita "Hebræi in *quinquagenos*: Vide 2 Reg. 1. 9—14. ubi idemtidem recurrit *dux quinquagenorum* "*et quinquaginta ejus*; i. e. cohors ejus. Nec in ſolo milite hæc uſitata diviſio, ſed et in "civibus judiciiſque, ipſo adeo jam Moſe inſtituente Exod. 18. 25. Ergo loca ſic diſpertior: "In Joſhuæ Judicumque libris חמשים militare nomen ſunt, *centurias*, ut nos dicimus, *militum* "deſignans; contra in Exodo, ubi neutiquam bellum parantes, aut ei parati Iſraelitæ egre- "diuntur, hæc verborum יצאו חמשים ſententia: *Juſſu Moſis, ne alter alterum impedirent, quin-* "*quageni ierunt, quibus, ut ſuſpicari licet, unus ex illis præfectus fuit.* Erant hi quinquageni, "viri, ut videtur, vigeſimum annum egreſſi, ſed trahebant ſecum uxores et liberos, ut mili- "tares quidem non eſſent manipuli, poſſent tamen facilius, ſi res poſceret, et bello parati "coire. Germanicè jam verterem *Sie zogen in hauffen von funfzigen eingetheilt aus Aegypten.*" —Which verſion hē has introduced into the ſecond edition of his Tranſlation; and which is approved of and adopted by Roſenmüller. Hezel corrects Luther's verſion thus: "Das im "Hebräiſchen ſtehende wort drückt nicht ſowol die *rüſtung*, als dieienige *ordnung* aus, in "welcher eine armee marſchiret: *Sie zogen alle, enrolliret in ſchlachtordnung, aus Aegypten.*" —Dathe, after Pococke, "Totum vero agmen Iſraelitarum in quinque partes diviſum erat, "cum ex Aegypto egrederentur."

A writer of *Fragments*, in Taylor's new Engliſh edition of Calmet's Dictionary, ſuppoſes that חמשים are the five principal officers who conduct or accompany a *caravan*. Moſes was *caravan-bachi*, or *head* of the caravan; ſome one elſe *captain of the march*; Hur *captain while reſting*; Joſhuah captain of the diſtribution; and Aaron *treaſurer*, or *pay-maſter*.—A fanciful and ill-ſupported hypotheſis.

To conclude, ſince in Joſhuah and Judges the word can hardly bear any other meaning than *accincti*, *armati*, ενζωνοι *; and ſince every SYNAGOGUE, even in the days of Jerom †, and all the old tranſlators, ſave Sep. and Theodotion, coincide in giving to חמשים nearly the ſame meaning here, I ſee no reaſon to depart from it, and have accordingly rendered *in battle-array*.—The only plauſible objection to this rendering is that of Fuller and Michaëlis, repeated by the author of *Fragments* juſt now quoted; namely, "It is not credible that the Iſraelites "were armed, becauſe Pharaoh was not ſuch a fool as to truſt them with arms, while under "ſervitude, nor could they *generally* have procured them ſince; nor could Pharaoh, with his "forces, expect to ſubdue ſo great a number juſt eſcaped into liberty, &c. &c."—This appears to me a frivolous objection. That they were not all armed, or at leaſt well armed, is more than probable; but that they were without arms is not only not probable, but the contrary is certain. For if they had no arms when they came from Egypt, where found they thoſe with

* Which is the very verſion of Sep. in both places of Joſhuah.

† "Aquila namque, qui ſtudioſius verbum in- "terpretatur ad verbum, in eo loco ubi Septuaginta poſuerunt *Quinta autem generatione aſcenderunt filii Iſrael de terra* "*Aegypti*, ita tranſtulit και ενοπλισαμενοι ανεβησαν. κ. τ. λ. id eſt, *armati aſcenderunt filii Iſrael de terra Aegypti*: licet "pro eo quod nos *armati* diximus, ſecundum Græci ſermonis ambiguitatem, *inſtructi* ſive *muniti*, propter ſupellectilem "qua Aegyptios ſpoliaverant, poſſit intelligi.... Aquilam autem, ut in cæteris, et in hoc *maxime* loco proprie tranſtu- "liſſe, omnis Judæa conclamat, et Synagogarum univerſa conſonant ſubſellia." Ep. ad Damaſum, tom. ii. p. 567.

which

which they ſo ſoon after fought and defeated the Amalekites * ?—It is true they were not a match for Pharaoh's army, becauſe it conſiſted of chariots and cavalry, which they wanted: and therefore it was wiſe in Moſes not to riſk a battle, where ſtratagem was preferable. Beſides, they might march in *battle-array*, or in the *order of battle*, although not all properly and completely armed, this being the fitteſt order to avoid confuſion in their march.

But how came *armed men* to be denominated חמשים? This indeed I cannot well tell. Some Rabbins ſay, they were ſo called becauſe they girded on their ſwords at the *fifth* rib! Others, becauſe they wore *five* ſorts of armour!—The reader will, perhaps, laugh at me for the following fancy; and let him laugh: *rides, et licet rideas:* I give it only as a *fancy*. The firſt weapons which men uſed were in all probability their own hands; and as each hand has *five* fingers armed with claws, one might be ſaid to *five it* when he ſcratched his enemy's face or plucked his hair, or puſhed him with his expanded fingers; for clinching the fiſt is an improvement upon the firſt rudiments of war, unknown yet to children in their puerile combats, unleſs they have been taught by ſome experienced pugiliſt. Certain it is that, in Arabic, חמש ſignifies *ſcalpere, faciem unguibus lacerare, percutere, mutilare; to ſcratch, ſtrike, wound,* &c. and חמש, even without the diacritic mark, *concitare ad pugnam,* to *excite* one *to battle;* probably by *brandiſhing* the hand.—If thou likeſt not this etymon, ſeek a better.

Ver. 21. *The Lord going before them, by day in a pillar of cloud, and by night in a pillar of fire,* &c.—In trackleſs, and often ſandy, deſerts, it is ſometimes as difficult to find one's way as over a trackleſs ocean †. Beacons are therefore neceſſary to direct the march. Among thoſe beacons, *ſmoke* and *fire* were commonly uſed by the Perſians, Arabians, and other nations ‡. The march of Alexander is thus deſcribed by Q. Curtius: "Tuba quum caſtra movere vellet "ſignum dabat; cujus ſonitus, plerumque tumultuantium fremitu exoriente, haud ſatis exau-"diebatur. Ergo perticam, quæ undique conſpici poſſet, ſupra prætorium ſtatuit, ex qua "ſignum eminebat pariter omnibus conſpicuum. Obſervabatur *ignis* noctu, *fumus* interdiu." It was uſual among the Arabs, as we learn from Frontinus §, to announce the appearance of an enemy by *ſmoke* in the day-time, and by *fire* at night: and I have ſeen the ſame ſignals uſed on the coaſt of Scotland for ſimilar purpoſes. To raiſe the ſmoke, a wet bundle of ſtraw was uſed. Toland and Von-der-Hardt imagined that the *pillar of cloud,* and *fire,* of Exodus, was, in reality, a fire ſimilar to that above mentioned; a ſacred fire carried about on a portable altar, of which the *ſmoke* by day, and *light* by night, directed the marches of the Iſraelites: and this, for aught we know, may have actually been the caſe: but the Hebrew hiſtorian, who could not be ignorant of ſuch a cuſtom, makes a miraculous cloud of it, in which cloud || he places Jehovah, or his angel, to direct the journeys and encampments of his choſen people. Moſes, however, ſeems not to have put much faith in its direction, ſince he was ſo ſolicitous to have Hobab to be a guide. See Num. 10. 31. and the Rem. upon it.—But to return to the Text: Michaëlis and ſome others would have עמוד ענן to be tranſlated a *ſtanding*, or *con-*

* Exod. 17. 9. † The compaſs is now ſometimes actually uſed in traverſing thoſe deſerts.
‡ See Herodot. Ouran. c. 40. Xenophon Cyrop. lib. viii. Q. Curt. III. 3. and V. 2. § Stratagem. l. 11. c. 25. || This ſame cloud covered the Convention-tent, or Tabernacle, immediately after it was reared; and continued to direct the encampments as before. See ch. 43. 34—38. and Num. 10. 33—36.

ſtant,

ſtant, cloud: but I ſee no cauſe for departing from the antient Verſions, which are more agreeable to the Hebrew conſtruction. It is not neceſſary to ſuppoſe that the cloud was in the form of a pillar. We ſtill, in common talk, call clouds and volumes of ſmoke *pillars*, when they have little or no reſemblance to real ones.

Ver. 22. *Was never removed.* The preſent Text has לא ימש; which our laſt tranſlators render "He took not away." But the Sam. copy has ימוש; and ſo read all the antient Verſions, even the Greek of Venice*; and ſo all our Engliſh tranſlations before that of Geneva.

CHAP. XIV.

THE paſſage of the Red-ſea, recorded in this chapter, has been the ſubject of much controverſy and criticiſm during the laſt part of this century.

Where and how it happened are the two principal points to be diſcuſſed. Till of late years, it was generally believed that the paſſage was at Bedea; which, according to Niebuhr, is about ſix German miles from Suez; and where the ſea (ſays Bruce) is ſomething leſs than four leagues broad, by fifty feet deep. To have dried a paſſage through ſuch a maſs of water would have been a prodigy indeed. But this hypotheſis has been fairly given up by our beſt modern critics; and the *Sinus Heroopolitanus*, or Gulph of Suez, pitched upon as the ſcene of action. The idea was firſt ſuggeſted by Le Clerc, and ſince adopted and defended by Michaëlis, Niebuhr, and almoſt all the German commentators. But theſe Germans are only for half-miracles: and Mr. Bryant ſtill contends for Bedea, and calls the arguments of Niebuhr *prejudice and miſconceptions* †.

For my part, who believe there was nothing miraculous in the event, I am poſitively for the paſs at Suez, or not far from Suez; where at this day there are ſhallows fordable at low water; and which might, in former times, have been frequently dry. We all know what changes happen in the bed of ſeas as well as of rivers, eſpecially where that bed is ſand, which that of the Gulph of Suez certainly is. The occurrence I conceive then to have happened thus. When Moſes ſaw that the Egyptians had found out, that the Iſraelites meant not to return, and were about to purſue him with a force which he could not reſiſt, he wiſely took the only courſe that was moſt likely to afford him an eſcape. Acquainted as he muſt have been, during his long ſtay in Midian, with the nature of the Red-ſea, and its ebbs and flows, he deemed it better to take his chance of paſſing over ſome ſhallow which he knew to be fordable at low-water, than to expoſe himſelf to be overtaken in a deſert where no ſtratagem could ſave him. If he got the ſtart of the Egyptians for but a ſingle day, he would have time to watch the tide, and begin his march as ſoon as the paſſage was fordable; and in the ſpace of a few hours might be ſafe on the other ſide. The width of the ſea at Suez is at preſent, according to Niebuhr's meaſurement, 757 *double paces*, or 3450 feet. It is common for the Arabs to paſs on foot over this paſſage, although not always without danger, as the ſea ſometimes flows back unexpectedly. "Novembris 27° 1563, (ſays Chriſtopher Fürer in his Itinerary,) ante reflexum "maris ego et Jacobus Bajerus partem maris rubri prope littus vado tranſivimus, magno

* Ουκ εκλυποι αν ὁ ϛυλος. † Obſervations upon the Plagues of Egypt, p. 378.

" tamen cum diſcrimine vitæ. Jam enim mare præter ſpem citius accreverat, ita ut, ante " egreſſum, aqua ad axillas pertingeret."—At Suez, according to Niebuhr, it is low water, at the full of the moon, at half paſt ſix; but as the paſſage of the Iſraelites muſt have happened ſome days after the full of the moon, the ebb and flow muſt have been conſiderably later, and the former fallen in the night-time, during which the Iſraelites are ſaid to have paſſed.—Michaëlis was of opinion, that, as a ſtrong wind is ſaid to have accompanied this event, it might have cauſed a double ebb, as it ſometimes does on the coaſt of Holland and North Germany: but Niebuhr thinks that no ſuch thing is likely to happen in the Red-ſea. Be that as it will, the wind might certainly have prolonged the ebb; and, if it happened at the time of the paſſage, might well be conſidered as a providential interference, and readily conſtrued into a miracle *. Joſephus, in recording this tranſaction, puts a formal ſpeech in the mouth of Moſes to his terrified and diſcontented people, and a prayer to God before he ſtrikes the ſea with his rod: yet he tells us that all this he has related as he found it in the ſacred books: Εγω μεν ουν ὡς ευρον εν ταις ἱεραις βιβλοις, ὑτως ἐκαιζον τουτων παρεδωκα. But he ſeems not ſure, whether to conſider it as a miracle or a natural effect. " Let no one," ſays he, " wonder at this account of " a way of ſafety being opened to thoſe old-world innocent folks, even through the ſea, whe- " ther by the will of God or naturally; ſince, of latter days, the Pamphylian-ſea opened a " way for Alexander's army, when God through him had decreed to overturn the Perſian em- " pire †." For this he appeals to all Alexander's hiſtorians: and, indeed, both Arrian and Appian, who relate the event, ſeem to have conſidered it as a ſort of divine interpoſition: but honeſt Strabo tells us that Alexander only took the advantage of low-water; and, truſting to his good fortune, paſſed through the ſtreight with his army: but not on dry land; for the water came up to the navel ‡.—The ſame was the caſe with Scipio's ſoldiers, who ſurpriſed New Carthage by taking the advantage of an ebb; although they waded ſometimes up to the knee, at other times up to the navel, in water. " Medium ferme diei erat, et ad id quod ſua " ſponte, cedente in mare æſtu, trahebatur aqua, acer etiam ſeptentrio ortus inclinatum ſtag- " num, eodem quo æſtus ferebat, et adeo nudaverat vada, ut alibi umbilico tenus aqua eſſet, " alibi genua vix ſuperaret." Liv. lib. xxvi. 45.—Here the ſame two natural cauſes, the tide and a ſtrong wind, concurred to make a paſſage through the water, as concurred at the paſſage of the Red-ſea; and in both caſes they were converted into a miracle. " Hoc, curâ et ratione " compertum, in prodigium ad Deos vertit Scipio, qui ad tranſitum Romanis mare verterent, " et ſtagno auferrent, viaſque ante nunquam initas humano veſtigio aperirent. Neptunum

* In the year 1672, when the Engliſh fleet attempted to make a deſcent on Holland, they were prevented by a ſingular occurrence.—When they arrived at the Dutch coaſt it was low water; ſo they were obliged to wait for the tide. The tide came, but laſted only two or three hours, when it ſtood ſtill until a new ebb ſupervened: and in the mean time the appearance of Admiral Ruyter with the Dutch fleet obliged the Engliſh to abandon their enterpriſe: and thus Holland was ſaved from impending ruin. And this, ſays Burnet, was conſidered as a *miracle*.

† Θαυμασει δε μηδεις του λογου το παραδοξον, ει αρχαιοις ανθρωποις και πονηριας απειροις ευρηθη σωτηριας ὁδος, και δια θαλασσης, ειτε κατα βουλησιν Θεου, ειτε κατ' αυτοματον, ὁποτε και τοις περι τον Αλεξανδρον τον βασιλεα της Μακεδονιας χθες και πρωην γεγονοσιν ὑπεχωρησε το Παμφυλιον πελαγος, και ὁδον αλλην ουκ εχουσι παρεσχε την δι' αυτου, καταλυσαι την Περσων ἡγεμονιαν του Θεου θελησαντος. Antiq. l. ii. c. 16. n. 5. ‡ Ὁ δε Αλεξανδρος εις χειμεριον εμπεσων καιρον, και το πλεον επιτρεπων τη τυχη, πριν ανειναι το κυμα ωρμησε και ὁλην την ἡμεραν εν ὑδασι γενεσθαι την πορειαν συνεβη μεχρι ομφαλου βαπτιζομενων. Strab. lib. xiv. p. 666.

" jubebat

" jubebat Ducem itineris ſequi, ac medio ſtagno evadere ad murum!"—I cannot better conclude than with the modeſt reference of Joſephus: " Of ſuch things, let every one think as " he pleaſes *."

So much for the principal event contained in this chapter. Let us reſume, in brief, its particular parts.

Ver. 2. *Phi-abiroth.* פי־החירות. Interpreted by Simonis and others *apertura cavernarum*, CAVES-MOUTH. I would rather derive חירות from the Arabic חור; and then it may either ſignify a *conflux of water* or a *ſheep-fold*. In this laſt ſenſe it was taken by Sep. απεναντι της επαυλεως: but as the פי *Phi* is not expreſſed by them, I would rather take it in the former ſenſe, and ſay that *Phi-abiroth* means *the mouth of the conflux*; i. e. I ſuppoſe, the northern point of the bay of Suez, where the tide ended. Jablonſki makes it a Coptic word compounded of the article PHI, ACHI *graſs*, and ROT *to grow*: *Locus in quo magna copia graminis provenit.* I doubt much if there be any ſuch place between Etham and Sues.—Döderlein makes *Phi-abiroth* the ſame with *Ad-gerud.*

Migdol. מגדל ſignifies a *watch-tower*; and is, not improbably, thought to be the *Magdolos* of Herodotus. Niebuhr imagines it to have been ſituated about *Bir-Suez.* See his map.

Baal-Zephon, בעל־צפן, ſignifies *the Lord of the North* †, and is by ſome ſuppoſed to have been a celebrated idol; " the only one," ſays the Bab. Thargum, " which had been left to " the Egyptians. Hence the Egyptians are wont to ſay, That Baal-Zephon is ſuperior to all " other idols; becauſe it was left, and not ſmitten with the reſt." Nugæ Rabbinicæ!—— Forſter and Michaëlis make it *Heroopolis.* See the map of Egypt.

Ver. 5. *When it was told to the king of Egypt that the people had fled*, &c. The word *fled* but ill expreſſes the Hebrew ברח; which here is equivalent to the Latin *aufugere*, and is well rendered אזל by Onk. and Syr. The people *had gone off.*—Michaëlis thinks that ברח here means *to turn the left ſide* to the ſea: " Der könig von Aegypten bekam nachricht, daſs das " volk ſic weiter zur rechten gewandt, und das meer zur linken liegen gelaſſen hätte." *Word was brought to the king of Egypt, that the people had turned about to the right, and had left the ſea on the left.* A needleſs paraphraſe, not authoriſed even by the Arabic word to which he appeals.—The ſhort note of Dathe is appoſite: " Iter trium dierum ſibi expetierat Moſes, " cap. 8. 23. ad ſacrificandum in deſerto: quibus exactis, ſperabat Pharao populum redi- " turum. Igitur, cum audiret eum ad ſinum Arabicum perveniſſe, intelligebat quo conſilio " diſceſſiſſet."

Ver. 7. *With captains over the whole.* ושלשים על כלו. The word שלשים is by Sep. rendered τριςατας, by Jerom *duces*; and ſo equivalently the other verſions. I once thought it might ſignify *three men* for every chariot; namely, two fighters and one charioteer ‡: and, in this caſe, the laſt part of the verſe would be properly rendered in our common verſion " over " every one of them." But then *captains*, which precedes, muſt be changed into ſomething elſe; for *captains* over *every one* of the chariots ſounds ſomewhat oddly. One of Kennicott's

* Περι μεν ουν τουτων, ὡς ἑκαςῳ δοκει, διαλαμβανετω. † Δεσποτε των αρκτων, Gr. Ven. Both Arabs have words that denote *the idol Zephon.* The other verſions retain the Hebrew word. ‡ And I ſince find the ſame idea in a Note of Origen on the *Catenæ.* Αλλοι δε φασιν ὡς εις τας χρειας των πολεμων ἁρματα εποιουν μεγαλα, ὡστε και τρεις χωρειν, ἱνα ὁ μεν εἰς ηνιοχῃ, οἱ δε δυοι πολεμωσιν. See Montfaucon, vol. i. p. 72.

MSS. has כלה; and this may have been the original reading, the *hé* and *vau* having been frequently interchanged, on account of their great reſemblance in the more antient alphabet: but all the other preſent copies both Heb. and Sam. have כלו.

Ver. 8. *Manifeſtly.* ביד רמה. Lit. *with a high hand*—Sep. εν χειρι υψηλη—Vulg. *in manu excelſa*—and ſo equivalently all the other verſions, except Onk. who has בריש גלי, *capite aperto*; i. e. *openly*, *avowedly*, *manifeſtly*; which I have followed in my Tranſlation.—Le Clerc, Dathe, and others, think that the phraſe is equipollent to ביד חזקה, *with a ſtrong hand*; that is, *under the protection of God:* but Michaëlis and Hezel prefer the other meaning; the former "öffent-"lich," the latter "mit aufgehabener hand" das iſt *öffentlich*, nicht etwa verſtohlen, oder heimlich.—To theſe I accede, but render *manifeſtly* rather than *openly*, becauſe I believe that the former word, in the Latin whence we have it, is perfectly equivalent to ביד רמה.

Ver. 20. *And* while to the former *it was a cloud of darkneſs*, to the latter *it enlightened the night.* The Hebrew is, ויהי הענן והחשך ויאר את הלילה; by Montanus literally rendered *Et fuit nubes et obſcuritas, et illuminavit noctem:* a very ſingular mode of ſpeech, and to me unintelligible. Our tranſlators were therefore obliged to ſupply the want with Italics, and render thus: "It was a cloud and darkneſs *to them*, but gave light by night *to theſe*." That the Hebrew is ſtrangely elliptical is evident from the pains that have been taken to explain it by the ancient interpreters. Onkelos makes clear work of it: "It was an obſcure cloud to the "Egyptians, but a light during all the night to the Iſraelites." So both Thargums, but ſtill more explicitly: "It was a cloud half lucid and half dark; on one ſide it was dark to the "Egyptians, on the other it gave light to the Iſraelites the whole night."—Syr.: "It was "a cloud of darkneſs the whole night, but gave light to the Iſraelites."—But moſt elegantly, and briefly, Symmachus: Και ην ἡ νεφαλη σκοτος μεν εκειθεν, φαινουσα δε εντευθεν.—Aquila more literally, and conſequently obſcurely: Εγενετο ἡ νεφαλη σκοτος, και εφωτισε συν την νυκτα. They both follow the Sam. reading, which wants the copulative before והחשך.—But moſt ſingular is the verſion of Sep.: Και εγενετο σκοτος και γνοφος *· και διηλθεν ἡ νυξ, *and the night came on.*—They could not have read in their copy ויאר את הלילה; but what they did read I cannot even gueſs.—Not leſs unaccountable is the verſion of Saadias: ועשנא אלליל, the cloud and darkneſs *obſcured the night.* Yet both make a ſenſe perfectly ſuitable to the context, if the Hebrew would admit ſuch a meaning.—I have, in my verſion, with Aquila, Symmachus, and Jerom, followed the Sam. lection, and ſupplied the ellipſis by the words in Italics.

Ver. 21. *A vehement eaſt wind.* רוח קדים עזה. And ſo Onk. Tharg. both Arabs †, Perſ. and Gr. Ven. But Sep. has νοτου, *a ſouth wind.* "And any philoſophical perſon," ſays Mr. King, "will perceive that ſuch a wind, ſweeping along the eaſtern coaſt of Africa and "of Arabia Fœlix, and driving the waters of the ocean back from the mouth of the Strait of "Babelmandel towards the Perſian Gulph, would naturally, in conſequence of the projecting "coaſt of Adel and Cape Guardafui, draw off the waters from the Red-ſea, and lower them "greatly; eſpecially if ſuch a wind co-operated with a ſtrong ebbing of the tide from the coaſt

* So Rom. and Ald. and Alex.; but Compl. and Glaſg. have γνοφος και σκοτος, more agreeable to the Hebrew.

† The Latin verſion of Saadias in the Polyglott has *auſtralem:* but I believe it to be a miſtake, and that ריחא קבולא means always *an eaſt wind.*

"of

" of Arabia, as was moſt probably the caſe." Morſels of Criticiſm, p. 87.—I have as great a reſpect for the Septuagint Verſion as Mr. King: but its authors were men, and fallible; and in rendering the word קדים, they have here and elſewhere, I think, miſtaken its meaning.—The Syr. Verſion and Vulgate have, the former רוחא דשובא, the latter *vento urente, a burning, drying wind:* and this ſignification has been adopted and defended with much ingenuity by Le Clerc, Michaëlis, and others; who think, with Mr. King, that an eaſt wind was better fitted to drive the waves upon the African coaſt, where the Iſraelites then were, than to divide them. But who can tell what wind would have this or that effect upon the Arabic gulph, at Suez, or any other part, without having been a witneſs to that effect? The Hebrews were by no means exact in their diviſion of winds; ſo that any wind which but held of the Eaſt may have been denominated רוח קדים: and here I am inclined to think that it means the north-eaſt wind, *Euraquilo.*—But one muſt have made a long ſtay at Suez, or in its vicinity, and been a diligent obſerver of the winds and tides, to form any thing like a proper judgment on the ſubject. Until that happen, it is beſt to ſtick to the etymon of the Hebrew word, and render the *eaſt wind.*—I have taken no notice of Houbigant's verſion of this verſe; becauſe I deem it neither natural nor compatible with grammar. *Et eadem nubes quæ caliginoſa fuerat, noctem ſic illuminabat, ut non tangeret unus alterum per totam noctem.*

Ver. 22. *The waters being,* as it were, *a wall,* &c. והמים להם חומה. I have here only to remark, after what I have ſaid in Expl. N. that in the Complutenſian, Aldine, and Roman editions of Sep. there is an erroneous reading—αυτης for αυτοις—which is the reading of Alex. Glaſg. Canon. Copt. and Ital.; and I doubt not that many of Dr. Holmes's MSS. will be found to have the ſame lection.—I add Roſenmüller's ſhort, but excellent, Note on the place: " Aquæ verò *murus,* ſive melius *præſidio* erant; id enim propriè denotat חומה (coll. Arab. " חמא *, *tuitus fuit, cuſtodivit.* Nam quum Iſraelitæ a dextra mare, a ſiniſtra vero aquas in " profundioribus locis extremi ſinus conſiſtentes, illorum latera ab Aegyptiis tuta erant (ihre " flanke war gedecht) atque ita rectè dici potuit *Mare eis præſidio fuiſſe.*"—Dathe retains the term *wall,* but modifies it thus: " Pro muro *quaſi* haberent."—Michaelis: " diente ihnen zur " mauer," *ſerved them for a wall* †.

Ver. 24. *The Lord viewing the Egyptian troops.* וישקף יהוה אל מחנה מצרים. Sep. επεβλεψε Κυριος επι (or εις) την παρεμβολην των Αιγυπτιων—Vulg. *reſpiciens Dominus ſuper caſtra Aegyptiorum*—and ſo equivalently all the other verſions, except Syr. which has this ſingular reading: אתחזי מריא למשריתא דמצרין, *the Lord ſhewed himſelf to the Egyptian army.* He muſt have taken וישקף for the 3d p. ſing. of the future of *Niphal:* and perhaps he was in the right. The Lord ſhewed himſelf to the Egyptians in a tremendous manner, in a tempeſt of thunder. To this no doubt the Pſalmiſt alludes when he ſays: " The voice of thy thunder was in the ſtorm! " lightnings illuminated the globe! the earth trembled and ſhook!" Pſ. 77. al. 76. ver. 19. Similar is the deſcription of Joſephus: Ομβροι τ' απ' ουρανου κατεβαινον, και βρονται σκληραι, προσεξαπτομενης αστραπης, και κεραυνοι δε κατηνεχθησαν. Antiq. lib. i. c. 16. p. 115.

* The Samaritan tranſlator underſtood חומה in the ſame ſenſe both here and in ver. 29. † Thus David and his men were a *wall* to Nabal's ſervants. 1 Sam. 25. 16. Secker.

Ver.

Ver. 24. *Put them in diſorder.* The printed Sam. Text has a word that ſignifies he was *incenſed* againſt them, יחם; but this is rectified by 5 mss. which have יחם, the Hebrew reading; and which was read by the Samaritan tranſlator. Thus the Sam. exemplar of the Text, where it is evidently faulty, may be for the moſt part corrected by the aid of mss. and reſtored to a purity, in my eſtimation, far beyond that of the Maſoretic Hebrew.—But of this largely, in another place.

Ver. 25. *He entangled.* The preſent Text has יסר, *he removed*, or, as our public verſion, *he took off*: and ſo moſt of the ant. verſions. But Sam. has יאסר, *he encumbered, entangled*, &c. and this was evidently the reading of Sep. and Syr. which to me appears to be the original genuine lection.

Ib. *They drove them with difficulty.* The Hebrew, ינהגהו בכבדת; which is variouſly underſtood and rendered. Sep. ηγαγεν αυτους μετα βιας, *he* [the Lord] *drove them with violence.* The ſingular number is alſo expreſſed by both Arabs. Perſ. and Gr. Ven.; but Onk. the Thargums, and Syr. expreſs it in the plural, and apply it to the Egyptians; and this I take to be the true meaning; the relative *vau* here correſponding with the plural antecedent מרכבתי, in the ſame manner as, after מרכבתי, it correſponds with מצרים.—To remove the enallagé, Houbigant puts ינהג in the coactive voice, and renders "quas cum *faceret eundo* tardiores."—Dathe's tranſlation is, "Rotæ curruum frangebantur, nec niſi admodum difficulter pedem "poterant promovere."

Ver. 28. *For the waters returning covered both chariots and horſemen,* &c. This may be eaſily conceived by thoſe who have paſſed the *Waſhes* between Norfolk and Lincolnſhire, or the *Milnthorp* and *Cartmel* ſands, in the great eſtuary between Lancaſter and Hookborough; where if there were not a guide, with a ſalary from Government, to direct and eſcort the paſſengers, they would often be ſwallowed up by the returning tide, and both *the horſe and his rider be caſt into the ſea.* "I am ſure," ſays a friend of mine, from whom I had an accurate account of thoſe ſands, "that Pharaoh and his hoſt would have periſhed in many ſuch tides "as I have ſeen on Lancaſter-Sands, and the Briſtol Channel; on both which I have ſeen "tides come in a breaſt of water two feet perpendicular, and roll rather faſter than a horſe could "trot." A few ſuch ſucceſſive *tides*, or billows, would ſoon overthrow an army, if they had no means to eſcape; as was the caſe with the Egyptians, on a ſhoal between two maſſes of water, a deep ſtagnation on the left hand, and the ſea on the right, both agitated with a vehement wind, which blew almoſt directly in their face. Then, if thunder and lightning attended the tempeſt, it would be terrible indeed; and they might naturally enough exclaim, "Let us flee from the Iſraelites, for the Lord fighteth for them againſt us:" although, how the Hebrew writer came to know that they ſo expreſſed themſelves it is hard to ſay, as none of them eſcaped to tell the diſmal tale. But the Hebrew hiſtorian was a *poet*, if not a *prophet*; and often gives us *what might have been* for *what really was.* For the reſt, extraordinary tides of the ſea have in all ages been attended with danger and death. When the emperor Valens was at Marcinopolis, in his way to Syria, ſuch a tempeſt happened, and ſuch agitation of the ſea, that in ſome places ſmall ſhips were driven over the walls of houſes, and in others the largeſt veſſels left dry on the ſand. The inhabitants of the city, going out to plunder,

plunder, were overtaken by the returning tide and buried in the waves *. Thoſe great commotions were not unfrequently accompanied by earthquakes. In the year 1034, there happened a dreadful one in Egypt and Paleſtine, which obliged the inhabitants to live in the open air during eight days. The ſea on this occaſion receded three *paraſangs* †, and on its return deſtroyed the people who had gone out to pick up fiſhes and ſhells ‡. In the very next year there were uncommon exundations of the ſea and of the rivers, by which many perſons loſt their lives §. But the moſt ſingular phænomenon of this kind is ſaid to have recently happened in South America. The waters of the river Plata were, in the month of April 1793, forced by a moſt impetuous ſtorm of wind to the diſtance of ten leagues; ſo that the neighbouring plains were entirely inundated, and the bed of the river left dry. Ships ſunk for more than thirty years were uncovered, and among others an Engliſh veſſel caſt away in 1762. Several perſons walked in the bed of the river without wetting their feet, and returned with ſilver and other riches long buried under the water. This continued three days, at the end of which the waters returned with great violence to their natural bed. See No. 85 of the Obſerver for July 1793.

Ver. 30. *Whom they now ſaw lying dead on the ſea-ſhore.* This was probably the next day, or at the following tide, which would throw up ſome of the bodies on both ſides of the gulph; but fewer, one would be apt to think, on the northern than on the ſouthern ſide.

Ver. 31. *And when the Iſraelites ſaw,* &c. *the people revered the Lord; and confided in the Lord, and in his ſervant Moſes.* This *reverence* and *confidence* were not of long duration, as we ſhall ſee in the next chapter.

CHAP. XV.

Ver. 1. *I WILL ſing.* אשירה. So the preſent Text in the ſingular; but all the Verſions, ſave Arab. Erp. Perſ. and Gr. Ven. have plurals. Sep. ασωμεν—Vulg. *cantemus*—Syr. Onk. Tharg. and Saad. נשבח.—Did they read נשירה in their copies? or did they conſider אשירה collectively, as applicable to the whole people of Iſrael? I am willing to believe the latter, and have therefore retained the ſingular number. The Sam. reading is אשירו, which is no Hebrew word, and which may be the blunder of a copyiſt, from the great reſemblance of *hé* and *vau* in the Sam. letters. But I am more inclined to think that the true reading of Sam. here is שירו *cantate*, as in ver. 21, where Mary, with the women, repeats the ſong; and where the Hebrew copies have alſo שירו. Certainly the Samaritan tranſlator muſt have read שירו,

* "Cum Valens, iter in Aegyptum faciens, perveniſſet Marcinopolin, magna tempeſtas orta, et mare commotum eſt; "ita ut naves minores muris urbis tranſilirent, et mare locum ſuum relinqueret, atque naves majores tanquam in arida "remanerent. Incolas urbis ad prædandum adcurrentes, mare, quod revertebatur, oppreſſit: ſubmerſi itaque ſunt." Bar-Hebræus, p. 67. in Bruns's Verſion, p. 70 in the original. † The length of a *paraſang* is not ſufficiently aſcertained; but the ſhorteſt eſtimation is thirty furlongs. ‡ "Mare ad tres paraſangas retroactum, cum ho- "mines ad piſces et conchylia colligenda exiiſſent, reverſum permultos eorum demerſit." Bar-Hebr. p. 233. al. 236. § "Homines, qui ſuper aſſibus et navium fragmentis ex aquarum fluctibus eluctati erant, cum ad continentem jam "pertigiſſent, *maris æſtus* retraxit et ſubmerſit." Ibid.

not

not אשירו, nor אשירה, in his copy; as he renders it שבחו, *ſing ye.* Nor is it very probable that Mary would have changed the firſt word of the ſong, and repeat it differently. But in ver. 21 all the copies of both Sam. and Heb. have uniformly שירו; although the antient Verſions vary there alſo; Sep. and Vulg. and Tharg. reading *Let us ſing:* but all the reſt have *Sing ye.* So that, on the whole, perhaps שירו is in both places the more probable reading.

Ib. *For highly hath he exalted himſelf.* כי גאה גאה. Sep. ενδοξως γαρ δεδοξασται—Vulg. *gloriosè enim magnificatus eſt*—and ſo equivalently the other Verſions, except Onkelos and the Thargums, which give another turn to the phraſe, and render, the former ארי אתגאה על גותניא, *becauſe he has magnified himſelf above the magnified*; the latter דהוא רם על רמיא, *becauſe higher is he than the higheſt:* and this idea has been adopted by Michaëlis, who in his German Verſion renders "denn er war höher als die ſtolzen." Luther's Verſion, although not literal, much better expreſſes the meaning, and is retained by Hezel: "denn er hat eine herrliche that "gethan." But in no Verſion is it better rendered than in Gr. Ven.: τω γαρ αιρεσθαι ηρται.

Ver. 2. *The Lord is my ſtrength, and the ſubject of my ſong.* עזי וזמרת יה. It is now pretty generally agreed, that a *jod* has been dropt from the end of וזמרת, from its contiguity to the next word יה. But what then ſhall we ſay of the Verſion of Sep. who certainly read neither יה nor וזמרתי, as they render βοηθος και σκεπαςης εγενετο μοι εις σωτηριον: and ſo the Ant. Italic, *adjutor et protector factus eſt mihi in ſalutem.* How could this be made out of the preſent Hebrew?—The Sam. printed Text, with 5 Heb. MSS. have וזמרתיה in one word, which Teller deems an abbreviation of וזמרתי יה *, *ob ſuavitatem cantionis:* but 10 Sam. MSS. with 2 or 3 Heb. MSS. have וזמרתי, without ה †, and I am ſometimes inclined to think that this may have been the original reading. It muſt have been the reading of the Samaritan tranſlator, who has only ונבזני.—On the other hand, Jerom, Onkelos, and both Arabs, read וזמרתי with the affix; and both they and Tharg. Perſ. and Gr. Ven. read יה, or יהוה, after וזמרתי or וזמרת.—This laſt reading is favoured by above 40 of De Roſſi's pointed MSS. which put the word זמרת in conſtruction with יה: but punctuation is a poor authority, and is here invalidated by the preceding word having an affix. If עזי be the true reading, it muſt be followed by וזמרתי; but whether יה ſhould follow, there is ſome reaſon to doubt. There is not another inſtance of this ſort of abbreviation in the whole Pentateuch, nor indeed until the days of David, when it became common in poetry. Whether Jerom. Onk. Tharg. Perſ. the Arabs, and Gr. Ven. read in their copies יה or יהוה cannot be known; but the Syriac Tranſlator moſt certainly read יה, as he retains it in his Verſion, and explains it by מריא ‡.—On the whole, we muſt, with Sep. and Sam. Verſions, exclude יה altogether, or read עזי וזמרתי יה, or rather יהוה; for this, I am perſuaded, was the original writing, abbreviated in poſterior copies to יה.

Ver. 3. *Mighty in battle is the Lord.* יהוה איש מלחמה §. Lit. *The Lord is a man of war:* an

* The Latin Tranſlator of Sam. in the Polyglott has, wrongly, *laus, mea* Deus, inſtead of *laus mea, Dominus.*

† One Sam. MS. has וזמרתי יה. ‡ His Latin Tranſlator has *Deus Dominus;* but the original is *Jah Maria.*

§ The Sam. lection is יהוה גבור במלחמה, *Jehovah mighty in battle*; which I have expreſſed in my verſion.—Vulg. *Dominus quaſi vir pugnator*—Onk. מרי נצחן יי—Syr. מריא גנברא וקרכתנא. He ſeems to have had before him the Sam. Text.—Saad. אללה דו אלמלאחם—Arab. Erp. אללה צאחב אלחרואב. All equivalent metaphraſes of the Hebrew.—Gr. Ven. more literally, ὁ οντωτης ανηρ πολεμου.—Singular again is the Septuagint Verſion: Κυριος συντριβων πολεμους: Ital. *Dominus*

an Hebraiſm for *a great warriour*; as *a man of blood* is *a blood-ſhedding man*, and *a man of words an eloquent man.*

Ib. *He whoſe name is IEVE.* יהוה שמו. Sep. Κυριος ονομα αυτω. Vulg. *Omnipotens nomen ejus:* not ſo properly.—The implied meaning is, that the Lord has now *been* to his people what he promiſed to *be* when he called himſelf IEVE, *HE-WILL-BE.*

Ver. 4. *He hath drowned.* The preſent Text has טבעו, *they are drowned:* but I prefer the reading of Syr. and Sep. which make God the nominative, more agreeably to the context. I call it the reading of Sep. becauſe, although the Rom. ed. has κατεποθησαν, all the other editions, with Glaſg. and Canon. (and other MSS. I doubt not,) have κατεποντισεν. To make out this meaning, there is no need of throwing away the affix from טבעו; for, "the choice of his "captains, *them* he hath drowned, &c." is a common Hebraiſm, and has been by ſome accounted an elegant pleonaſm even in our own language.

For much the ſame reaſons, I prefer, in

Ver. 5. the reading of Sam. יכסמו to the Hebr. יכסימו, or, as ſeveral MSS. have it, יכסיומו. I cannot here do better than tranſcribe De Roſſi *. "Codex meus 223, pluribus aliis variis "lectionibus jam illuſtris et ſingularis, habet *ſceva*, et *kibbutz* ſuper abraſionem; ut videatur, "procul dubio, ex prima manu legiſſe יְכַסֵּימוּ per *tzeré* 'obtexit;' relato ad Deum verbo, "quod quum maſculinum ſit, non niſi per anomaliam et generis enallagen referri poteſt ad "præcedens תהמות *abyſſi:* Ita Sep. ποντω εκαλυψεν αυτους; eoſque ſecutus eſt ex hodiernis "criticis cl. Schulzius †.—Plene יכסיומו Kennicottiani ac mei nonnulli, ſed nullus יכסמו, ut "habet Sam. T. ‡, vel יכסומו abjecto *jod*; nullus מו per *cholem.*"—It is no objection to the Sam. and Septuagint reading that there is no prefix before תהומות. The verb כסה is in other places conſtructed in the ſame manner. Thus Jonah, 3. 6. ויכס שק, *and covered himſelf* with *ſackcloth.* Pſ. 8. 11. al. 10. כסו הרים צלה, *the mountains were covered* with *its ſhadow.* Nay the very word in queſtion is in Pſ. 104. 6. conſtructed in the ſame manner: תהום כלבוש כסיתו, *thou coveredſt it* with *the deep, as with a garment.* The other reading, however, ought to have been marked among my Var. Read. vol. i. p. 127. thus al.: *The gulphy billows covered* them.

Ver. 8. *By the breath of thy noſtrils,* &c. ברוח אפיך. Lit. *in ſpiritu naſi tui.* But Sep. δια πνευματος του θυμου σου—Vulg. *in ſpiritu furoris tui*—and ſo equivalently almoſt all the antient verſions; even Gr. Ven. εν πνευματι θυμου σου.—Wrath, indeed, is a metaphorical meaning of אף; becauſe the paſſion of anger is ſtrongly expreſſed by the noſtrils.—This metaphor was not unknown to the Greeks and Latins:—

Ου θεμις, ω ποιμαν, το μεσαμβρινον, ου θεμις αμμιν
Συρισδειν· τον Πανα δεδοικαμες· η γαρ απ' αγρας

Dominus conterens bella. Houbigant thinks they read גורר, "ſcripturam pravam, ex germana גבור derivatam." And, indeed, if their copy was written in Sam. characters, of which I have no doubt, it was very eaſy for them to miſtake a *beth* for a *reſh*, and read גור for גבר: but even this miſtake is a proof that גבר or גבור was then the genuine reading; a reading far more noble than איש. * Appendix, vol. iv. p. 222. † "Miror omnes interpretes locum vertere potuiſſe *texerunt eos abyſſi.*" Schulze in loc. ‡ Three MSS. have יכסימו.

Τανικα κεκμακως αμπαυεται· εντι γε πειρος,
Και οι αει δριμειαι χολα ποτι PINI καθηται *.

Thoſe who like the metaphorical meaning better may correct my verſion thus: *By the breath of his anger*, or *indignation*, &c.

Ib. *Upheaved were the waters.* נערמו מים. This is not the ordinary ſignification of ערם in Hebrew; but in Hebrew poetry we are often obliged to ſeek the meaning in the ſiſter dialects; and here both the Syr. and Arab. come naturally in to our aid, in which ערם, among other acceptations, has that of *acervation, accumulating, upheaving*. But, although I have in my verſion adopted this meaning, I am not quite certain of its being the genuine one. The verſion of Sep. is διεςη το ὑδωρ, *the water was divided*; which ſignification is, perhaps, reducible to the common meaning of ערם *naked*; as if the poet meant to ſay, that *the waters* were ſo divided as to leave the ground bare and *naked*. But the other ſignification is more poetical, and well paints the retiring of the billows by a ſtrong ebb †.

Ver. 10. *They ſank.* צללו. Teller and Lette think the word ſhould be rendered *timitum dederunt ut plumbum:* but lead has little or no *ring*, and *ſank* is far more poetical.—Sep. εδυσαν.

Ver. 11. *Among the mighty ones.* באלם in the printed Heb. Text; but Sam. and more than 70 Heb. MSS. have the word full באלים. 2 Heb. and 6 Sam. MSS. have באילים; and 5 Heb. MSS. have באילם. Such is the variety of lection in the Text: let us ſee how the word has been underſtood by the ant. tranſlators.—Sep. εν θεοις ‡—Vulg. *in fortibus*—Onk. paraphraſes the comma thus: *There is none beſide thee: thou art God the Lord; beſide thee there is no God.*—More literally Tharg. מן כוותך באילי מרומא, *Who like thee among the high gods?*—By Syr. the word בלאים is entirely omitted—Both Arabs, פי אלמעבודאת, *among the falſe gods*—Perſ. נר באדיאונד, *among the powerful*—Gr. Ven. εν θεοις, *among gods.*—In this variety of reading and rendering, I have preferred *mighty ones*; which is the marginal reading of our public tranſlation.

Ver. 14. *Peoples ſhall hear.* שמעו עמים. Which Sep. and the other ant. interpreters render in the præterite; ηκουσαν εθνη, &c. It would have been more proper, as well as more poetical, to render in the preſent; for the preſent in poetry is elegantly put for the future, as it is here §.—There is in the Latin Vulg. a ſingular reading in this place, *aſcenderunt*; which, how it has got into all the copies, whether printed or manuſcript ‖, it is not eaſy to conceive.

* Theocrit. Idyl. 1. 15. thus well tranſlated by Heinſius:

Non equidem fas eſt, media de luce, bubulce,
Ludere: nam Faunum metuo, qui feſſus in herba,
Venandi ſtudio, requieſcit, et aſper habetur:
Nam gravis illius ſub NARIBUS æſtuat ira.

† Bene Roſenmüller: "Facile quivis intelligit, has dictiones nullo modo urgendas et propriè ſumendas eſſe: de-
" ſcribitur poëtice receſſus maris." ‡ Sym. εν δυαξαιαις. § "Nondum quidem hæc audire potuerant
" vicinæ gentes, ſed brevi audituræ erant. Itaque famam jam brevi ſpargendam, quaſi jam ſparſam deſcribit Moſes."
Roſenmüller. ‖ At leaſt which I have ſeen: and their number is far from being ſmall, as I have looked into every copy that came in my way, in expectation to find ſome other reading.

Houbigant

Houbigant thinks it was originally *attenderunt*, and reproves Amama for carping at Jerom for a blunder of his tranſcribers. But this is too peremptory. Jerom was not likely to confound *attendo* with *audio*; nor is there a ſingle inſtance of his having rendered the Hebrew word שמע by *attendere* *. It is קשב, and ſometimes נגם, which he expreſſes by *attendere*; but never שמע. I cannot therefore believe that he wrote *attenderunt* here; but that *audierunt* (howſoever it came to be changed into *aſcenderunt*) was Jerom's rendering.—At what time *aſcenderunt* crept into the Text of the Vulgate I cannot gueſs, but I find it was not in Aelfric's copy; for he tranſlateth *gehiræth thiodæ*, &c. See Twaites's Appendix, p. 30.

Ver. 16. I cannot, with Teller and others, ſee the propriety of rendering יעבר by ſimply *marching*; which agrees not with the next verſe ſo well as *paſs-over*. Whether the Thargumiſt did well to add *the Jordan*, is a queſtion in which I am not concerned. He is often abſurd in his additions.

Dr. Kennicott has given a diviſion of this Song in parts. To Moſes he aſſigns ver. 1 and 2. Ver. 3 is a chorus of men. Then Mary, with a chorus of women, repeats, *O ſing ye to Jehovah!* &c. Moſes reſumes and ſings ver. 4—8. The women repeat *O ſing ye to Jehovah!* &c. Moſes then ſings ver. 9—13. The women repeat the ſame chorus. Moſes ſings ver. 14—18. And a grand chorus, by all, concludes by JEHOVAH SHALL REIGN FOR EVER AND EVER!—All this is pure fancy: and I believe that not any two perſons, who ſhould ſeparately ſet about dividing the piece in parts, would coincide in a ſingle ſection.

For the reſt, every reader of taſte muſt deem it a moſt beautiful compoſition, and worthy to be put in competition with the beſt pieces of Greece or Rome: indeed, in my eſtimation, it ſurpaſſes any thing of the kind that Rome or Greece ever produced †. The curious reader may ſee an excellent illuſtration of its beauties, by Herſant, in the ſecond vol. of Rollin's *Belles Lettres*; or in a more recent work entitled *L'Eloquence ſublime des Auteurs ſacrés dans les Cantiques*, by Joubert, in 6 duodecimo volumes, publiſhed in 1787.

Ver. 26. *For I... am your phyſician.* כי אני רפאך. I have not rendered *For I am he who healeth you*; becauſe thoſe who are preſerved from diſeaſe need no healing. The Greek of Venice has therefore very properly rendered εγω γαρ ὁ ιατρος σου. So Luther and Michaëlis: "Ich bin dein arzt." And ſo the Hebrew word רפא is ſometimes well rendered in our public verſion. See Gen. 50. 2.; 2 Chron. 16. 12.; Job, 13. 4.; Jerem. 8. 22.—It is ſomewhat remarkable that in the Otaheitean language the word *rapaoo* denotes a *phyſician*. See Cook's Laſt Voyage ‡.

CHAP. XVI.

Ver. 3. *Bread.* לחם. This Hebrew word comprehends every ſort of *eatable*, and is perfectly equivalent to our *meat*, before it's ſignification was abſurdly reſtricted to *fleſh-meat*.

* There is one inſtance, indeed, found in Jerem. 29. 8. where Jerom renders תשמעו by *attendite*: but it is there in conſtruction with the prepoſition אל, which changes its nature from ſimple *hearing* to *attentive hearing*. ואל תשמעו אל חלמחכים, *and attend not to your dreams.* † Ver. 9 is particularly beautiful. ‡ I owe this obſervation to the late Mr. Stephen Street.

Ver. 6. *Ye ſhall know, that the Lord brought you out of the land of Egypt.* Could they poſſibly doubt of this, after all that had been done for them, if all that is related in the preceding chapters had been done in the ſame manner and with the ſame circumſtances as there related? And ſhall a flight of quails and a fall of manna work more conviction in their minds than ſo many ſucceſſive more wonderful miracles, to which they had, according to our hiſtorian, been ocular and auricular witneſſes? There is truly ſomething aſtoniſhing in all this.—But proceed we in our remarks.

Ver. 10. *The glory of the Lord appeared in the cloud.* It was probably a thunder-ſtorm; which the Iſraelites had rarely ſeen in Egypt, but which is frequent in the deſert which they were now traverſing. The majeſty of Jupiter is thus deſcribed by Ovid:—

Aethera conſcendit, nutuque ſequentia traxit
Nubila; queis nimbos, immiſtaque fulgura ventis
Addidit, et tonitrus et inevitabile fulmen. Metam. iii. 299.

Ver. 13. *Quails.* השלו. Some have imagined that not *quails*, but *locuſts*, are meant.—Others think שלו is the *flying-fiſh*, which is ſeen in the Red-ſea. But it is now generally allowed that it is that ſpecies of quail called by the Greeks ορτυγομητηρ, and by the French *roi des cailles*. We might call it the *royal quail*. "It is of the ſize of a turtle-dove: I have met "with it in the wilderneſs of Paleſtine, near the ſhores of the Dead-ſea and the Jordan, between "Jordan and Jericho, and in the deſerts of Arabia-Petræa. If the food of the Iſraelites "in the deſert was a bird, this is certainly it; being ſo common in the places through which "they paſſed." Haſſelquiſt, Engl. Tranſ. p. 203. See alſo Shaw, Niebuhr, Forſkal, Ruſſel, and Harmer: and, among the antients, Joſephus Antiq. lib. iii. c. 1. n. 5. Diodorus Siculus, lib. i. p. 38. edit. Rhodomanni.

Ib. *Came up, and covered the camp.* A quotation from Proſper Alpinus will explain this: "Coturnicibus uſque adeo tota ea regio abundat pinguiſſimis, ut ruſtici eas non retibus, ſed "propriis manibus, celeri curſu perſequentes, capiant, eaſque ita vili pretio vendant, ut de-"nario argenteo *Maidin* vocato, viginti habeantur." Rer. Ægypt. lib. iv. c. 1.—See more on *quails* in Numb. 11. 13.

Ver. 14. *Something ſmall and ſhining.* דק מחספס. The word מחספס is one of thoſe that occur but once in the Bible; and conſequently its preciſe meaning is uncertain. Hence it is variouſly rendered by the ant. interpreters. Sep. ὡσει κοριον, *like coriander*.—Vulg. *quaſi pilo tuſum*—Onk. מקלף, and Syr. מתקלף, rendered in the Polyglotts *decorticatum* and *decorticabile*: but which perhaps would be better rendered *quaſi raſura*, *like filings*, or *ſcrapings*. See Levit. 14. 41. where for the Hebrew את העפר אשר הקצו, *the duſt that hath been ſcraped off*; Onk. has ית עפרא די קליפו. The ſcrapings of a wall are not unlike to what the manna is afterwards deſcribed to be; *hoar-froſt*.—Saad. מדחרח, *a ſomething round*—Arab. Erp. מקשר, by Golius rendered *rotundum*; but which, perhaps, has the ſame meaning as the Chald. of Onkelos—Perſ. בוסת־בנודה, *ſkin-covered*. Gr. Ven. renders the two Heb. words דק מחספס by one, λεπτοςρογυλον, *ſmall-round*.—The verſions of Aq. Sym. and Theod. are loſt.

Of theſe tranſlators, who ſeem to have had no certain idea of the import of the Heb. word, ſome appear to have gueſſed the meaning from the ſize of the manna, as Sep.; others from its form,

form, as Saad. and Gr. Ven.; others from its external appearance, as Onk. and Syr.—The Perſic tranſlator, who was probably well acquainted with the ſhrub which produces the manna, ſeems to have had in his mind the capſule, or pod, in which the grains are contained; and which is about an inch long, and two lines thick. The grains themſelves are about a line in diameter, but of an oval form, and of a browniſh colour. But theſe grains are not the manna; which is an *eliquation* from the ſhrub itſelf, called by the Perſic botaniſts *terengabin*; of which there are two ſorts. The one is of a coarſe compoſition, a maſs of liquefied juice mixed with the grains, huſks, leaves, and prickles of the ſhrub; ſometimes bigger than one's fiſt, and of a bitter taſte. The other, which appears to be the *manna* of the Iſraelites, conſiſts of ſmall, round, cryſtalline, pellucid grains, about the ſize of coriander, and in colour and form not unlike to *maſtich*. This is the pure manna, ſhaken from the ſhrub in the morning, before the ſun riſes; whereas the other, melted by the heat, coaleſces with leaves, prickles, and pods, and becomes a mixed impure lump. The ſhrub on which it is found is a ſpecies of thorn, called by the Perſians ארושירין, *aru-ſhirin*, or *ſweet-thorn*. It is alſo called אלחאג, *alhag*, and is the ALHAGI *foliis ſimplicibus, lanceolatis, obtuſis, caule fruticoſo ſpinoſo*, of Linnæus *.—For the reſt, the Orientaliſts believe that the *teringabin*, or *manna*, falls, like dew, upon the plant, from the heavens. It taſtes like a compound of ſugar and honey; and in Kurdiſtan and Iſpahan, and other places, ſerves for the ſame uſes.—It is very different from the manna of our ſhops, which comes principally from Calabria, and is the condenſed juice of a ſpecies of aſh.—See Hunter's edition of Evelyn's Silva, p. 151. And on the other, or true *manna*, may be conſulted Tournefort's *Voyage de Levant*; Geoffroy's *Materia Medica*; Otter's *Perſiæ Itinerarium*; and Niebuhr's *Deſcription of Arabia*.

But to return to the meaning of מחספס. Moſt modern tranſlators, among whom our Engliſh, following Pagninus and the Jewiſh rabbis, render *round, globular*, &c. Le Clerc *molle*, from the Chald. חספך *ſoft clay*: but this is a forced interpretation, as Houbigant well obſerves. Houbigant derives the Heb. word from the Arab. חסף. "In qua radice," ſays he, "ineſt "mundatum eſſe, comminutum, friatum: qui ſignificatus quadrat in דק minutum." True; but it is for this very agreement that I would reject the etymology; as it induces an uſeleſs pleonaſm; which, however, was adopted by Dathe, *parvum quiddam, valde minutum*.—Michaëlis would derive the Heb. word from the Arab. חשף, *frigore concrevit, nix*; and renders "ſhneeförmiges," *like ſnow*.—I think the Samaritan tranſlator has given the true meaning, מנצנץ, *ſhining*; which is alſo found in the Arab. האשף; from which I would derive the Hebrew word, and have rendered accordingly "ſomething ſmall and *ſhining*."—Hezel, I find, underſtood it in nearly the ſame ſenſe, as he renders "durchſichtig," *pellucid*.

Ver. 15. *What is it?* מן הוא MAN-HU. Our common verſion: "They ſaid one to an-"other, *It is manna*: for they wiſt not what it was." "Very ſtrange † and unintelligible!" ſays Kennicott. "Let the words be tranſlated literally thus: *They ſaid one to another, What is* "*this? for they wiſt not what it was.* From this queſtion מן, which in Chald. now ſignifies "*what*, the manna afterwards took its name. So the Greek verſion τι εστι τουτο; and Joſe-

* It grows in almoſt all the Eaſtern countries, Armenia, Georgia, Perſia, and in both Arabias; but eſpecially in Arabia-Petræa, between Sinai and Tor. † Strange as it is, it is the verſion of many tranſlators beſide ours. It is that of Luther, the Tigurine, the Genevan, Diodati, Le Clerc, Houbigant, and even Dathe.

"phus

" phus ſays, Man ſecundum noſtram locutionem, interrogationis particula eſt *."—The Doctor might have added all the ant. verſions, (ſave one, of which preſently,) which uniformly read interrogatively, taking מן for a particle of interrogation.—Yet this interpretation, ſo ſuitable to the context, has been queſtioned by ſome modern critics, and a different meaning given to the comma. Their objection to the common rendering is, that מן, as an interrogative, is uſed only with reſpect to living creatures; as מה is to inanimate things. This is generally true; but might not a Chaldaiſm have here been uſed, as in ſome other places? Could the Septuagint tranſlators be ignorant of the ſignification of מן? I think not; nor even Joſephus, although his authority be not equal to theirs. It muſt, however, be allowed, that the comma is ſuſceptible of another meaning, which is neither *ſtrange* nor *unintelligible*. מן may be a contraction from מנה; and ſo it was underſtood by the Perſic tranſlator, who has נעמת, *beneficium, donum*; as if the Iſraelites had ſaid " This is the bounty" *which the Lord promiſed us*; " for they knew not what" *name to give it*. He had, probably, in view, the Arabic מן, *benevolent, beneficent* †. Aben-Ezrah, Jarhi, and our Ainſworth, derive the word from מנה, and render, " This *is the food*, or *portion*, prepared *for us*." Still I am inclined to think that the antients have well rendered; and have, with Michaëlis, retained their verſion " What is it?" —The note of Caſtalio is here ſo appoſite, that I cannot withhold it from my readers:— " Man-hu interpretantur Hebræi *donum eſt:* ſed non bene, mea quidem ſententia. Primum, " hoc verbum pro *dono* nuſquam alibi ponitur; niſi quod volunt mutilatum a מתנה. Sed hoc " ludere eſt, vel potius hallucinari. Nam hac ratione licebit quodvis verbum de quovis de- " ducere, modo vel unam literam habeat cum illo communem. Præterea, non dicerent " Hebræi, *donum eſt*; ſed *cibus eſt*; et quidem cum articulo (ה): non enim *donum* eis, ſed " *cibum* promiſerat Deus. Ad hæc, cum dicat Moſes; *neſciebant enim quid eſſet:* oportet " in eo eſſe dubitationem, et ignorantiam; quæ nulla eſſet, ſi dicerent: *Donum eſt.*—Sed

* The words of Joſephus are: Καλουσι δε Εβραιοι το βρωμα τουτο MANNA το γαρ MAN· επερωτησις κατα την ημετεραν διαλεκτον. Antiq. lib. iii. c. 1. n. 6. † Faber has adopted and defended this derivation in his *Hiſtoria Mannae Hebræorum*; firſt printed at *Kiel* in 1770, and reprinted among the ſmaller works of Reiſke and Faber, at *Halle*, in 1776. See Sect. ii. p. 87; or, in the latter ed. p. 127.—To this opinion Roſenmüller aſſents, and thus expreſſes himſelf: " Igitur ei adſtipulor ſententiæ quam protulit Faber. Hic Mannæ nomen repetit a verbo Arabico מנן " *largiri, liberaliter conferre beneficium in aliquem*; unde מן eſt *largitas, munificentia, donum*; et deinde ipſa *Manna*, quaſi " præcipuum ſit liberalis donum naturæ ac beneficium. Unde intelligitur, quum Hebræi campis manna ſuperfuſis, ea con- " ſpecta, eſſetne vera *Manna*, necne, quæſiviſſent, eos antea nomen quidem cognitum habuiſſe, rem non item. Fortaſſe " eis illa ſolum Mannæ ſpecies nota fuit, quæ in Ægypto invenitur, et diverſa eſt ab ea quæ in Arabia colligitur; quam " quum nondum vidiſſent, interrogaſſe videntur; an etiam hæc Manna eſſet?"—The firſt part of this Note is at variance with the ſecond. If Man ſignify *a gift, munificence, largition*, how could the Iſraelites ſay, " Is this, too, " manna?" inſtead of " This is a gift!"—More conſiſtent Hezel, who reforms Luther's verſion, " Das iſt Mann," thus: " Beſſer, fragweiſe: *Iſt dieſes Manna?*" *Is this Manna?*—For the reſt, I cannot but approve of what Roſenmüller ſays, in the concluſion of his Note: " Nemini igitur mirum videbitur, *Mannam* ſolitum Iſraelitarum cibum " fuiſſe. Neque vero exiſtimandum eſt, Mannam tanta multitudine inventam fuiſſe, ut omnibus Iſraelitis, ne uno " quidem excepto, ad ſaturandum ſuffecerit. Hoc nuſquam dicit Moſes. Nec dicit Moſes, ullo in loco, per totum " annum in omnibus locis, per quæ Iſraelitæ iter faciebant, collectam fuiſſe: dicit tantum, in univerſum, ver. 35. " Iſraelitas eâ in cibum uſos eſſe per quadraginta annos, donec ad terminos Chananææ perveniſſent."—The Manna ſeems only to have been to them in lieu of bread; for their flocks and herds muſt have afforded them a ſupply of butcher meat; and flights of migratory birds might now and then afford them a more rare and delicious food.

" bene

" bene verterunt Græci et Hieronymus; *Quid eſt hoc?* Cujus interrogationis ratio ſubjun-
" gitur: neſciebant enim quid eſſet. Nec obeſt quod MAN, non MAH, legitur: eſt enim
" idem, ut in Pſalm. 6. 1.* legitur."

Ver. 18. *He who had too much kept not the overplus.* The Jewiſh rabbis, who are ever for multiplying miracles, tell us, that whatever quantity of *manna* was gathered by each individual, when he came to meaſure it, he had no more than an *omer.* " But the meaning," ſays Roſenmuller, " is, that, although the Iſraelites gathered, ſome more, ſome leſs, yet, when it came " to be divided, each received the ſame quantity: *ita ut is qui parum collegerat non minorem* " *portionem acciperet, quam is qui plus collegerat.*"—The reader may chooſe which of theſe interpretations he pleaſes.

Ver. 19, 20. *And Moſes ſaid to them, Let no one leave of it until the morning: but ſome of them hearkened not to Moſes, and left of it until the morning; when it bred worms, and ſtank.* Hitherto there is nothing in the manna of the Iſraelites that differs from the common manna, except that the former is ſuppoſed to have been found in greater quantities: but here a property is aſſigned to it which has not been remarked to belong to the common manna; namely, that it bred worms, and ſtank, when kept until the next morning: and in this, according to ſome interpreters, conſiſted a part of the miracle. Another conſiſted in its continuance at all times and ſeaſons for the ſpace of forty years: this, however, as has been already obſerved, cannot be abſolutely inferred from the words of the hiſtorian. But the moſt wonderful circumſtance is, that it was not to be found on the ſabbath-day; and that the double portion which was gathered the day before, although kept until the next morning, neither ſtank nor bred worms. Yet the Jewiſh commentators are not content with theſe miraculous circumſtances. The Thargums tell us, that, when the manna was liquefied by the ſun, it became copious ſtreams, that flowed as far as the *great ſea*; and that clean animals of various kinds came to drink of it, which the Iſraelites hunted down and ate. And no wonder that rivers were formed out of the liquefaction, if, as is aſſerted in the *Mechilta*, the manna was four cubits high on the ground†.—They add that it ſuited every palate, and became every ſort of food which the eater wiſhed it to be!

Ver. 21. *When the ſun grew hot, it melted away.* This is preciſely the caſe with Arabic manna of the preſent day. See Niebuhr's Deſcription of Arabia, p. 141.—See alſo the curious Itinerary of Rabbi Petachia, publiſhed, with a Latin verſion, by J. C. Wagenſeil; and inſerted in Ugolini's Collection, tom. vi. pag. 1197.

Ver. 23. *Bake ... what ye will bake, and boil what ye will boil,* &c. How theſe operations were performed, the hiſtorian tells us not. To what I have ſaid in my Expl. Note, I ſhall only add Roſenmüller's remark. " Manna duplici modo torreri poteſt. Uno, ſi nulla alia " adhibita materia ſuper modico igne liqueſcit; et ita ſimilis fit ſaccharo hordaceo (barley-

* Caſtalio ſhould not have ſo confidently adduced this as a ſimilar caſe, as it is doubtful if הֲ ſtood there originally in the Text; and, if it did, whether it have an interrogative meaning. See Crit. Remark on that place.

† R. Eliezer Amodai makes it 60 cubits. See the *Mechilta* publiſhed by Ugolini in his xivth tom. of Hebr. Antiquities, p. 296 and 300. Alſo the Book called *Siphri* apud eundem, tom. xv. p. 187.; or Buxtorf's Diſſertatio de Manna, tom. viii. p. 587. et ſeq. in which the opinions of Aben-ezrah, Abarbanel, and the other chief Jewiſh commentators, are reported.

" ſugar)

" ſugar) quod in noſtris officinis *manna tabulata* vocatur: altero, ſi admixta farina frigitur, ut " placentæ mellitæ inſtar fiat. Quomodo vero manna coquatur definiri non poteſt. Fortaſſe, " admiſſa aqua, coquebatur in potum, ſimilem ei quem ex aqua, melli ſilveſtri et aromatibus " ab Arabibus confici ſcribit Diodorus Siculus, lib. xix. c. 104.—Otter, loco ſupra citato *, " refert, mannam ibi, admixtâ aquâ, coqui uſque ad ſpiſſationem."—It was boiled into a ſort of jelly, or electuary.

Ver. 31. *Like coriander-ſeed.* That is, in ſize; for, in colour, it was white and cryſtalline.

Ver. 32, 33, 34. There is here an apparent parachroniſm; for neither ark nor teſtimonial tables yet exiſted. We muſt, therefore, refer it to ſome future period. " Facile intelligitur," ſays Dathe, " Moſen hoc loco temporis ordinem non ſervare: tunc enim nondum neque ten- " torium neque arca fuit: ſed complectitur Moſes hoc loco omnia quæ de manna memoriæ " prodere voluit; ut ſupra fecit in hiſtoria de agno paſchali."—Be it ſo: yet ſurely this is a very odd and incorrect method of writing hiſtory; and one is naturally apt to ſuſpect that the compiler of the Pentateuch, whom I believe not to have been Moſes, committed here, as elſe-where, a ſmall overſight †.

Ver. 34. The addition here, which I have inſerted in my verſion as from Sep. is only yet found in a various reading, thus al. ελαβε δε Ααρων την ζαμνον, και ενεβαλεν εις αυτην εκ του μαν πληρες το γομορ; which, I truſt, will be found in ſome of Holmes's MSS. and which, at any rate, I believe to have been originally a part of the Text. The Text, as it now ſtands, is both mutilated and tranſpoſed. The words כאשר צוה יהוה אל משה ſhould either be joined to ver. 33. or placed at the end of ver. 34. It cannot belong to ver. 34, if placed at the begin-ning; for there is no example of ſuch a conſtruction, the copulative immediately following: and even united to ver. 33, it muſt ſeem rather odd in the mouth of Moſes ‡. The Syr. tranſlator was aware of this, and rendered, " as the Lord commanded me:" and indeed this is the only way to render it properly, in its preſent poſition.

The urn is ſaid to have contained an omer of manna; i. e. according to our common computation, about ſix pints, wine meaſure: but very little is to be depended upon ſuch cal-culations; for every one knows that meaſures and weights change their quantities without changing their denominations; and who can preciſely tell what was the meaſure of an omer in the days of Moſes? If an omer contained ſix pints, it was a copious dole indeed for each perſon, unleſs it were very much reduced by being *baked* or *boiled* §.

With reſpect to the manna-urn itſelf, we hear no more of it; nor is it any where ſaid what

* Perſiæ Itinerarium, pars ii. p. 197. † Houbigant thinks, that the words *before the Lord*, and *beſide the teſtimony*, have no relation to the *convention-tent*, or *teſtimonial tables*; but to a *tent* and *teſtimony* prior to them. " *Fa-* " *cies Domini* ſignificat eum locum, ubi Deus ſe preſentem eſſe declarabat, nempe prope columnam itineris ducem, ubi " Moſes Deum conſulebat, ubi populus in conſpectum Dei veniebat; ſeu tentorium eſſet, ſeu atrium ſeparatum. Ibi " manna deponere Aaron jubetur."—Biſhop Wilſon adopted this idea. " This," ſays he, " was before the ark was " made; for we muſt not imagine that Iſrael was till then without a place of public worſhip, called *before the Lord*, or " *Teſtimony*. Ver. 34." ‡ Such *metonymies*, however, are not uncommon in the Hebrew language; and if the comma be added to ver. 33, the words *as the Lord commanded Moſes* will be a part of Moſes's order to Aaron, and equivalent to *as the Lord commanded me*. But ſtill I think the words much better placed at the end of ver. 34.
§ All that the hiſtorian ſays of it is, that it was the tenth part of an *epha*. If the epha, as ſome think, contained only 32 pints, the omer was little more than three: and this is certainly a more conſentaneous proportion.

became

became of it. "When Solomon placed the ark in his Temple, there was nothing in it but "the two tables of ſtone, which Moſes, at Horeb, had placed in it." 1 K. 8. 9.—The Jews ſay it was, together with the ark, Aaron's rod, and the anointing oil, buried by Joſias in a ſecret excavation prepared for the purpoſe by Solomon, who foreſaw the deſtruction of the Temple *.—On the other hand, the Samaritans will have it that thoſe ſame precious things were hidden on Mount Garizim by the high-prieſt Ozi; who, as Reland thinks, was contemporary with Samſon.—Both Jews and Samaritans confeſs that they have never ſince been diſcovered: but the Chriſtians have been more fortunate: for, not a hundred years ago, the manna-urn, at leaſt, was found in three different places—Rome, Paris, and Bourdeaux †.

CHAP. XVII.

Ver. 6. *LO! yonder ... I will await thee.* הנני עמד לפניך. Well rendered by Sep. Ιδου εγω εςηκα εκει, προ του σε [ελθειν] επι της πετρας ‡.—Not badly Gr. Ven. Αυτικα εγω ἱςαμαι ενωπιον σου επι της πετρας.—The meaning is obvious; namely, that the Lord would be there before Moſes —would *wait him* there.

Ver. 9. *To-morrow.* מחר. I have followed the diviſion of Sep. and Syr. who point after מחר; and with them read ואנכי with the copulative.

Ver. 10. *Went to fight.* I follow Sep. and Syr. who read in their copies ויצא להלחם; και εξελθων || παρεταξατο τῳ Αμεληκ—ואוזל למעבד קרבא עם עמלק.—If the preſent defective reading be contended for, להלחם muſt be rendered *in order to fight*; or the whole colon thus: "And "Joſhuah prepared, as Moſes had ſaid to him, to fight:" but the other reading is more conſonant with Hebrew phraſeology, and with the general mode of narration followed by the hiſtorian: "Moſes ſaid to Joſhuah, Chooſe out men, and GO and fight with Amalek: and "Joſhuah did as Moſes ordered him; and WENT to fight with Amalek."

Ver. 11. *His hands.* The preſent Text has ידו, *his hand*; and ſo both Arabs, Perſ. and Gr. Ven. But Sam. Sep. Syr. Onk. Vulg. and even the Thargums, have *his hands*, ידיו; and ſo the context evidently requires. See ver. 12.

Ver. 12. *His hands.* Sep. and Onk have *the hands of Moſes*, αι χειρες Μωυσῃ §—ידי משה.

Ver. 14. In this and the two following verſes are ſeveral difficulties, which perhaps have not yet been fully removed. The words כי מחה אמחה, &c. have been commonly rendered "For "I will utterly deſtroy;" or, as our Engliſh tranſlators, "put out." But this mode of ren-

* See Abarbanel on 1 K. 6. 19. † See Reland *De Nummis Samaritanis*, in Ugolini's Collection, tom. xxviii. p. 1214. ‡ So Compl. But Ald. has ὁδε εγω εςηκα προ του εκεισε σε ελθειν επι της πετρας—Alex. Ὁδε εγω εςηκα εκει προ του σε ελθειν επι τας πετρας—Rom. wants ελθειν, but elſe agrees with Alex. The Glaſg. Octateuch has ὡδε for ὁδε, and joins it to the preceding verſe; has γαρ between εγω and εςηκα; and has εκει inſtead of ελθειν. This laſt word indeed ſeems to have been added by way of illuſtration, as both Copt. and Ital. follow the Rom. Copy—Canonici's MS. has ελθειν; and probably ſeveral others. || So Compl. and Rom. with Ox. Ambroſ. and Copt. But εξελθων is wanting in Ald. and Alex. as alſo in Glaſg. and Canon. § So all the copies and MSS. which I have ſeen; and ſo Copt. and Ital. It is therefore clearly the genuine reading of Sep. But whether they found משה in their Text, or ſupplied it, is not ſo certain; although I am inclined to believe, from the concurrence of Onkelos, that the original Text had ידי משה, and not ידיו. It makes no difference in the meaning; but the former reading is more explicit, and agreeable to the Hebrew idiom.

dering deſtroys the meaning of the Text; for to me it is clear, that the *memorandum* or *memorial* here mentioned are thoſe very words; and that כי ought to be rendered, not *for*, or *becauſe*, but *that*; as the Septuagint have rightly done, *ὁτι*; and ſo even the Greek of Venice, *ὁτι τῳ απαλειφειν απαλειψω.* Nor did Onkelos or Syr. miſtake the meaning of כי, as the former renders it by ארי, and the latter by מטל.—The *enim* of Vulg. ſeems to have miſled moſt modern tranſlators. Jerom would here have done better to follow the Old Ital. *Quoniam deletione deleam.*

Ver. 15. *IEVE NISSI.* יהוה נסי. Rendered by Sep. Κυριος καταφυγη μου*—Vulg. *Dominus exaltatio mea.*—Onkelos, who knew not well what to make of his Text, paraphraſes the verſe thus: "Moſes builded an altar, and offered [ופלח] upon it before the Lord, who had "operated wonders, דעבד ליה נסין."—Syr. מריא נסי, retaining the Hebrew word: and ſo the Thargums—Both Arabs, אללה עלמי, *God my ſignal*—Perſ. *The Lord my wonder-worker*—Gr. Ven. *ὁ οντωτης σημειοι μου.*

In order to come at ſomething determinate, let us firſt fix the true reading. Both the Hebrew and Sam. printed Texts have נסי; and there is but little variety in the MSS. One Hebr. MS. has ניסי; one Sam. has נס; another, נסה; and another, נסרי.—That נסי was the original reading is rendered highly probable from the Syriac tranſlator having retained the very word in his verſion. Now the word נסי may be conſidered either with or without an affix. If the *jod* be conſidered as an affix, ſtill נס may come from either of two roots, נוס or נסס. The Septuagint derived it from the former; Jerom from the latter.—On the other hand, Onk. and the Perſic tranſlator ſeem to have conſidered נסי as one word, derived from נסא or נסה *elevavit ſe*; and Joſephus's NIKAIOΣ may be drawn from the ſame ſource. In this ſenſe it was taken by the Sam. tranſlator, יהוה נצוחה *Dominus triumphans:* and one Sam. MS. is favourable to this interpretation.

In ſuch a variety of interpretations, we muſt be guided, I think, by the context: but the context itſelf is ſtill more obſcure than the word in queſtion; and the reaſon which is given why the altar was called יהוה נסי correſponds not with any of the meanings given to that title; nor can any ſenſe, in my opinion, be made out of ver. 16. until the preſent Text be corrected. The preſent Text is—

ויאמר כי יד על כס יה מלחמה ליהוה בעמלק מדר דר.

Thus literally rendered by Montanus: "Et dixit, quia manus ſuper thronum Domini, bellum "Domini in Amalec, a generatione generationem;" which if any one underſtand, he muſt have a keen acumen.—But let us ſee how the antients have acquitted themſelves. Sep. *ὁτι εν χειρι κρυφαιᾳ πολεμει* † Κυριος επι Αμαληκ απο γενεων εις γενεας. Inſtead of יד על כס יה, they muſt have read in their copy יד כסויה על *in manu occulta.* Vulg. *Quia manus ſolii Domini, et bellum Domini erit contra Amalec, a generatione in generationem* ‡. He read in his copy כסא, which is ſtill the Sam. lection, and muſt have been that of Onk. and the Thargumiſts; although, for the reſt, they make ſtrange paraphraſes of the whole verſe. Both Arabs and Perſ. alſo read כסא: but the two former took יד על כסא to be an oath; and the latter thought יד ſignified

* So Compl. and Canon. but Ald. Alex. Glaſg. and Ambroſ. have *μου* after Κυριος. † Alex. *πολεμησει.*

‡ Thus rendered by the Douay tranſlators: "Becauſe the hand of our Lord's throne, and the war of the Lord, "ſhall be againſt Amalec from generation to generation." What is the hand of a throne?

power,

power, as it indeed often does. The Greek of Venice has here a ſingular verſion: ὅτι χειρ' ἐφ' ὑμιν τε ονοματου, κ. τ. λ. For כס על he read עלכם; which makes at leaſt a tolerable ſenſe: but then יה or יהוה ought to be placed after יד.

With the moderns I ſhall be ſhort, as almoſt all their various renderings are reducible to the two contained in the Text or margin of our Engliſh tranſlation. The textual verſion is: "For he ſaid, Becauſe * the Lord hath ſworn *that* the Lord *will have* war with Amalek from "generation to generation." In the margin: "Becauſe the *hand of Amalek is* againſt the "throne of the Lord; therefore, &c." The former is the more common verſion of modern tranſlators; the latter of Junius, Bonfrerius, Malvenda, Le Clerc, Seltener, Purver, and, what is ſtranger, Dathe †. More ſtrangely ſtill, in my opinion, Michaëlis: "So lang hände "auf dem thron Gottes liegen, wird Jehovah von geſchlecht zu geſchlecht krieg wider Ama-"leck führen:" *As long as hands ſhall be laid on the throne of God, will the Lord, from generation to generation, carry on a war againſt Amalek* ‡. He is not, however, unwilling to admit Le Clerc's conjecture; namely, that for כס we ſhould read נס: hence, according to him, would ariſe the following verſion: "Quia contra ſignum Jehovæ fuit manus *Amalekitarum*, "erit bellum, &c." But this conjecture is much older than Le Clerc, and much better applied by Caſtalio, whoſe verſion is: "Quia Jovæ manus ſigno admota eſt (inquit) Jovæ "bellum cum Amalechitis ſuſceptum eſt æternum." On which he has the following ſenſible annotation: "Ad verbum ſic legitur: *Quia manus ad ſignum Jovæ: bellum eſt Jovæ cum Ama-*"*lechitis in ſempiternum.* Reddit autem rationem nominis aræ, quam יהוה נסי vocavit a נס "quod eſt *ſignum*, id eſt vexillum. Nam quod in Hebræo legitur כס mendum eſt, tum quia "nominis ratio non redderetur, quia nomen *Jovaniſſi* non a כס deductum eſt, ſed a נס; tum "quia כס nihil ſignificat, quanquam volunt poſitum pro כסא, i. e. *ſolio:* ſed et puncta mu-"tant, et vocem mutilant, et etymologiam atque ſenſum pervertunt: neque ullum locum ha-"bent, ubi ita ſit poſitum niſi hunc; qui cum ſit controverſus, teſtimonio eſſe non poteſt. "Jum quam facile נ in כ degeneraverit, ex figuræ ſimilitudine intelligi poteſt." This is genuine criticiſm; which Le Clerc, probably, had not read; otherwiſe he would have acknowledged his obligation to Caſtalio. Be that as it may, the conjecture was adopted by Houbigant, who improves upon it, and, dividing the Hebrew Text thus, כי יד על נסי המלחמה, renders "Nam manus Domini, inquit, erit in perpetuum ad vexilla belli, contra Amalec;" *the hand of the Lord ſhall be at the ſignals of war, againſt Amalek.* This is plauſible; but, to me, not ſatisfactory. Let us ſee if nothing better can be found.

Lobſtein thought he had found a treaſure in the Genoveſan Sam. MS. of Kennicott's 221. which for יד reads אד, which in Arab. ſignifies *ecce, behold.* From this reading, and the meaning given to it, he renders thus: "Behold Jehovah on the throne: the Lord will war againſt "Amalek, &c." He thinks that a certain reſemblance between the *jod* and *aleph* in the Sam. or Phenician alphabet might have given occaſion to ſome inattentive copyiſt to miſtake the

* Heb. *The hand upon the throne of the Lord.* † "Dixit enim: Quia manus (ſcil. Amalekitarum) contra thronum Jovæ ſublatæ fuerunt, bellum contra Amalekitas perpetuum eſſe debet." To which he adds this Note: *Thronus Dei erat tunc apud Iſraelitas, quorum rex erat.* ‡ "I have rendered the common Hebrew Text," ſays he in a Note, "as well as I could. The meaning is, As long as there ſhall be a ſupplicant in Iſrael to lay hands on "God's altar, &c."

one for the other. Or, perhaps, he copied from a reader who confounded כי אד with כי יד.— This is poſſible, but it is not ſatisfactory; for why would the Hebrew writer here borrow an Arabic interjection, when he had a common Hebrew one at hand? Is there another example in the whole Bible where אד ſtands for חן or רא? Beſides, what paronomaſia is here? what relation to the name of the altar?

Moſt ſingular is the verſion of Bate: "He ſaid, Surely the hand with the cup of the "Everlaſting upon it, is war from Jehovah, &c." He took כס for כוס, a cup: יד על כוס יה can never ſignify *the hand with the cup of the Everlaſting upon it* *.

The Rev. Mr. Dimock would correct the Text thus: כי ידע לכם ידי, *that it may be known to you:* but this ingenious emendation deſtroys the alluſion to the preceding title, which we naturally expect here.

Let me now venture my own conjecture and diſtribution of the Text. With Caſtalio and Houbigant, then, and with one Hebrew MS. I read נס, not כס, nor even כסא; becauſe I cannot poſſibly ſee what *throne* has here to do, or what tolerable ſenſe can be made out of it.— With Houbigant I alſo reject יה as the compendium of יהוה, but retain the letters, as belonging to two different words. The *jod* I affix to נס, and the *bé* I prefix to מלחמה. Then reading, at the end of the verſe, ודר, which is the Sam. lection, I thus, with Houbigant, write and point the Text—

ויאמר כי יד על נסי המלחמה ליהוה בעמלק מדר ודר.

But I do not, with Houbigant, conſider נסי as the plural of נס, but the ſame with נסי of the preceding verſe, to which the alluſion is evidently made. The literal verſion of the Text, thus corrected, will be: "Nam dixit, quod manus *erit*, ſub vexillo meo, belli Domini cum "Amalek, a generatione ad generationem." The word יד, *hand*, is here to be taken in a metaphorical ſenſe, as in 1 Sam. 15. 12. and 2 Sam. 18. 18. denoting a *monument*, or *index*, to preſerve the memory of ſome important tranſaction. This metaphor I have endeavoured to render, intelligibly, in my verſion †, in which the alluſion to the name of the altar is clearly expreſſed, and this without changing a letter in the Text but one, a *caph* into a *nun*; which two letters are very eaſily miſtaken one for another, not only in the modern Heb. alphabet, but likewiſe in the old Samaritan: and, indeed, the permutation is of a very antient date, ſince it appears to have been in the copy of Sep. ‡

* His Note is: "Heb. *hand on the cup*. The hand was cut, we may ſuppoſe, on one of the ſtones of the altar; "and if the cup was *in* the hand, the hand muſt be *on* the cup: and ſo the words deſcribe the device exactly as it "was: and this is a ſpecimen of hieroglyphical writing." † This, I truſt, will by competent judges be deemed a more natural verſion than that of Houbigant, who makes *hand* relate to *the Lord*, and tranſlates נסי *banners*; for although there is in this verſion ſome alluſion to יהוה נסי, it is not ſo complete as when נסי is made a ſing. with the affix י.—The author of *Commentaries and Eſſays*, who alſo adopts the reading נסי, thinks that a *jod* has been dropt after יד, and refers this word to Moſes: "Becauſe my hand (hath been) upon the enſign of the Lord, ſo Jehovah will have "war, &c."—The enſign, ſays he, was the rod of God, which Moſes bore; that ſign or token of divine authority by which he led the people, &c. This interpretation appears to me not natural: but let the intelligent reader compare and chooſe. ‡ I have ſometimes imagined that κορυφαια might be the original rendering of Sep.; in which caſe they may have read in their Heb. copy, not כסיה, but נסיה, with a *nun*. Perhaps ſome of Dr. Holmes's MSS. may favour this conjecture.

CHAP.

CHAP. XVIII.

Ver. 1. *The Lord God.* Although I have added *the Lord* on the authority of only one MS. I am convinced it ſtood originally in the Text, as it is ſtill preſerved in Sep. Onk. Tharg. Perſ. although without *God* after it. Vulg. Syr. both Arabs, and Gr. Ven. have *God* only.

Ib. *How he* [the Lord] *had brought*, &c. Moſt copies of Sep. render כי הוציא יהוה, as if it were a parentheſis: εξηγαγε γαρ Κυριος: but the Oxford MS. has rightly ὡς εξηγαγε. The particle כי here means *quomodo*, not *quia*.

Ver. 2. *After ſhe had been ſent back.* אחר שלוחיה. Sep. μετα την αφεσιν αυτης. Vulg. *quam remiſerat*, equivalently: nor is there any reaſon to ſuſpect, with Mariana and Houbigant, that he read אשר for אחר: the *re* in *remiſerat* ſufficiently expreſſes the latter word, which was read by all the ant. tranſlators.

Ver. 6. *And it was ſaid to Moſes, Lo! thy father-in-law*, &c. The preſent Heb. and the Sam. printed Text have אני *I* before חתנך. Hence our Engliſh, with moſt modern tranſlators, render the colon thus: "And he ſaid unto Moſes, I, thy father-in-law Jethro, am come unto "thee." But "the great impropriety," ſays Kennicott, "of Jethro ſpeaking to Moſes be- "fore he met him, and of Moſes going out to meet Jethro after he had been ſpoken to by "Jethro, will convince us that the word אני, I, is corrupted, from a word very ſimilar in "ſound; הנה, *behold*; agreeably to the Greek and Syr. verſions. And though the Sam. Text "is printed with the ſame corruption here as the Heb. almoſt all the Sam. MSS. read הנה ... "The whole difficulty is therefore removed by rendering: *And it was told Moſes, Behold thy* "*father-in-law Jethro is come*, &c."—To this the ſticklers for אני reply, that a man ſays to another what is reported by his meſſenger; and this is true: but ſtill the reading הנה is here preferable: nor does the example brought from Exod. 6. 6. in the ſmalleſt degree militate on the other ſide. To make the caſes ſimilar, the Text here ſhould be: "And Jethro ſent word "to Moſes, ſaying, I am, &c." I am perſuaded, that if הנה were the reading of the Heb. Text, and אני that of Sep. Syr. and 14 Sam. MSS. the latter would be reprobated by thoſe who now defend it *.

Ver. 11. *Becauſe they had dealed haughtily with them.* The Hebrew words are, כי בדבר אשר זדו עליהם, and are placed in the Text at the end of ver. 11; but what ſenſe they can have there is is not eaſy to perceive. They are thus literally rendered by Montanus: *Quia in re qua ſuperbierunt contra eos:* and by our laſt Engliſh tranſlators: "For in the thing wherein they "dealt proudly *he was* above them †.—The antient interpreters vary in their verſions. Sep. ἐνεκεν

* Secker, in his MS. Notes, adopts the reading of Sep. and renders: "And one ſaid to Moſes, Behold, thy father- "in-law, &c." † Cranmer: "For in the thing whereby they dealt cruelly with them are they themſelves "periſhed."—Biſh. "For in the thing whereby they dealt cruelly with them were they deſtroyed themſelves."—Genev. "For as they have dealt proudly with them, *ſo are they recompenſed.*"—Bate: "Becauſe in the thing in which they "prided themſelves *he was* above them."—Purver: "Becauſe *he* was in the matter wherein theſe did proudly againſt "them."—All ſqueezed out of the Hebrew againſt the grain, and preſenting no tolerable conſequential meaning. Nor are the verſions of other modern tranſlators more ſatisfactory. Caſtalio, indeed, gives a plauſible turn to the verſe: "Nunc

one for the other. Or, perhaps, he copied from a reader who confounded כי אד with כי יד.— This is poſſible, but it is not ſatisfactory; for why would the Hebrew writer here borrow an Arabic interjection, when he had a common Hebrew one at hand? Is there another example in the whole Bible where אד ſtands for חן or חא? Beſides, what paronomaſia is here? what relation to the name of the altar?

Moſt ſingular is the verſion of Bate: "He ſaid, Surely the hand with the cup of the "Everlaſting upon it, is war from Jehovah, &c." He took כס for כוס, a cup: יד על כוס יה can never ſignify *the hand with the cup of the Everlaſting upon it* *.

The Rev. Mr. Dimock would correct the Text thus: כי ידע לכם ידי, *that it may be known to you:* but this ingenious emendation deſtroys the alluſion to the preceding title, which we naturally expect here.

Let me now venture my own conjecture and diſtribution of the Text. With Caſtalio and Houbigant, then, and with one Hebrew MS. I read נס, not כס, nor even כסא; becauſe I cannot poſſibly ſee what *throne* has here to do, or what tolerable ſenſe can be made out of it.— With Houbigant I alſo reject יה as the compendium of יהוה, but retain the letters, as belonging to two different words. The *jod* I affix to נס, and the *hé* I prefix to מלחמה. Then reading, at the end of the verſe, דר, which is the Sam. lection, I thus, with Houbigant, write and point the Text—

ויאמר כי יד על נסי המלחמה ליהוה בעמלק מדר ודר.

But I do not, with Houbigant, conſider נסי as the plural of נס, but the ſame with נסי of the preceding verſe, to which the alluſion is evidently made. The literal verſion of the Text, thus corrected, will be: "Nam dixit, quod manus *erit*, ſub vexillo meo, belli Domini cum "Amalek, a generatione ad generationem." The word יד, *hand*, is here to be taken in a metaphorical ſenſe, as in 1 Sam. 15. 12. and 2 Sam. 18. 18. denoting a *monument*, or *index*, to preſerve the memory of ſome important tranſaction. This metaphor I have endeavoured to render, intelligibly, in my verſion †, in which the alluſion to the name of the altar is clearly expreſſed, and this without changing a letter in the Text but one, a *caph* into a *nun*; which two letters are very eaſily miſtaken one for another, not only in the modern Heb. alphabet, but likewiſe in the old Samaritan: and, indeed, the permutation is of a very antient date, ſince it appears to have been in the copy of Sep. ‡

* His Note is: "Heb. *hand on the cup.* The hand was cut, we may ſuppoſe, on one of the ſtones of the altar; "and if the cup was *in* the hand, the hand muſt be *on* the cup: and ſo the words deſcribe the device exactly as it "was: and this is a ſpecimen of hieroglyphical writing." † This, I truſt, will by competent judges be deemed a more natural verſion than that of Houbigant, who makes *hand* relate to *the Lord*, and tranſlates נסי *banners*; for although there is in this verſion ſome alluſion to יהוה נסי, it is not ſo complete as when נסי is made a ſing. with the affix י.—The author of *Commentaries and Eſſays*, who alſo adopts the reading נסי, thinks that a *jod* has been dropt after יד, and refers this word to Moſes: "Becauſe my hand (hath been) upon the enſign of the Lord, ſo Jehovah will have "war, &c."—The enſign, ſays he, was the rod of God, which Moſes bore; that ſign or token of divine authority by which he led the people, &c. This interpretation appears to me not natural: but let the intelligent reader compare and chooſe. ‡ I have ſometimes imagined that χορυφαιᾳ might be the original rendering of Sep.; in which caſe they may have read in their Heb. copy, not כסיה, but נסיה, with a *nun*. Perhaps ſome of Dr. Holmes's MSS. may favour this conjecture.

CHAP.

CHAP. XVIII.

Ver. 1. *The Lord God.* Although I have added *the Lord* on the authority of only one MS. I am convinced it ſtood originally in the Text, as it is ſtill preſerved in Sep. Onk. Tharg. Perſ. although without *God* after it. Vulg. Syr. both Arabs, and Gr. Ven. have *God* only.

Ib. *How he* [the Lord] *had brought*, &c. Moſt copies of Sep. render כי הוציא יהוה, as if it were a parentheſis: εξηγαγε γαρ Κυριος: but the Oxford MS. has rightly ὡς εξηγαγε. The particle כי here means *quomodo*, not *quia*.

Ver. 2. *After ſhe had been ſent back.* אחר שלוחיה. Sep. μετα την αφεσιν αυτης. Vulg. *quam remiſerat*, equivalently: nor is there any reaſon to ſuſpect, with Mariana and Houbigant, that he read אשר for אחר: the *re* in *remiſerat* ſufficiently expreſſes the latter word, which was read by all the ant. tranſlators.

Ver. 6. *And it was ſaid to Moſes, Lo! thy father-in-law*, &c. The preſent Heb. and the Sam. printed Text have אני *I* before חתנך. Hence our Engliſh, with moſt modern tranſlators, render the colon thus: "And he ſaid unto Moſes, I, thy father-in-law Jethro, am come unto "thee." But "the great impropriety," ſays Kennicott, "of Jethro ſpeaking to Moſes be- "fore he met him, and of Moſes going out to meet Jethro after he had been ſpoken to by "Jethro, will convince us that the word אני, I, is corrupted, from a word very ſimilar in "ſound; הנה, *behold*; agreeably to the Greek and Syr. verſions. And though the Sam. Text "is printed with the ſame corruption here as the Heb. almoſt all the Sam. MSS. read הנה . . . "The whole difficulty is therefore removed by rendering: *And it was told Moſes, Behold thy* "*father-in-law Jethro is come*, &c."—To this the ſticklers for אני reply, that a man ſays to another what is reported by his meſſenger; and this is true: but ſtill the reading הנה is here preferable: nor does the example brought from Exod. 6. 6. in the ſmalleſt degree militate on the other ſide. To make the caſes ſimilar, the Text here ſhould be: "And Jethro ſent word "to Moſes, ſaying, I am, &c." I am perſuaded, that if הנה were the reading of the Heb. Text, and אני that of Sep. Syr. and 14 Sam. MSS. the latter would be reprobated by thoſe who now defend it *.

Ver. 11. *Becauſe they had dealed haughtily with them.* The Hebrew words are, כי בדבר אשר זדו עליהם, and are placed in the Text at the end of ver. 11; but what ſenſe they can have there is not eaſy to perceive. They are thus literally rendered by Montanus: *Quia in re qua ſuperbierunt contra eos:* and by our laſt Engliſh tranſlators: "For in the thing wherein they "dealt proudly *he was* above them †.—The antient interpreters vary in their verſions. Sep.

ἐνεκεν

* Secker, in his MS. Notes, adopts the reading of Sep. and renders: "And one ſaid to Moſes, Behold, thy father- "in-law, &c." † Cranmer: "For in the thing whereby they dealt cruelly with them are they themſelves "periſhed."—Biſh. "For in the thing whereby they dealt cruelly with them were they deſtroyed themſelves."—Genev. "For as they have dealt proudly with them, *ſo are they recompenſed.*"—Bate: "Becauſe in the thing in which they "prided themſelves *he was* above them."—Purver: "Becauſe *he* was in the matter wherein theſe did proudly againſt "them."—All ſqueezed out of the Hebrew againſt the grain, and preſenting no tolerable conſequential meaning. Nor are the verſions of other modern tranſlators more ſatisfactory. Caſtalio, indeed, gives a plauſible turn to the verſe: "Nunc

ἑνεκεν τουτου, ὁτι επεθεντο αυτοις—Vulg. *eo quod ſuperbe egerunt contra illos.*—Conformable to theſe are the Syr. and Perſ. verſions: but Onkelos and the Thargums paraphraſe thus: "Becauſe "by the ſelf-ſame judgement which they thought to have inflicted on the Iſraelites were them-"ſelves judged."—This idea ſeems to have been prevalent in the time of Philo.—Saadias ſeems to have underſtood the words in a ſimilar ſenſe: אר עאקבהם באלאמר אלדי אנפחנוא בה עליהם.—Conſonant is Arab. Erp. לאן עאקבהם אללה באלאמר אלדי תוקחוא בה עליהם.—Gr. Ven. moſt literally, as uſual: ὁτι εν τῳ λογῳ, ᾧ ηκρατευσαντο επ' αυτους: leaving his reader to ſupply what word he pleaſed.

That ſomething ſhould be ſupplied, our critics agree: but what is it?—Le Clerc makes the gods of Egypt the nominative to זדו, and their pride the antecedent to עליהם. "Quia id, quo "ſuperbiebant, contra eos *fuit.*"—Houbigant fancied that זד had been dropped after זדו; and, making *the Egyptians* the nominative to זדו, renders "Quoniam *Ægyptii contra eum* ſe extule-"rant, *extulit ſe* contra illos."—Mr. Dimock would ſupply גבר after זדו; "In the thing they "boaſted of *he prevailed* againſt them."—Dathe repeats גדול, or הגדול, *ex antecedentibus*; and renders, "Nam in eo ipſo, in quo illi (Ægyptii) Iſraelitas longe ſuperabant, magnum ſeſe ex-"hibuit." That is, "For in that very thing, (namely, cavalry,) in which they (i. e. the "Egyptians) far ſurpaſſed *the Iſraelites*, he (i. e. the Lord) ſhewed himſelf great." This, I confeſs, appears to me a ſtrange verſion. Michaëlis is of opinion that Jethro alludes to the cruelty of the Egyptians in drowning the male children of the Iſraelites, and renders: "Denn "in eben dem element bewieſs er ſich groſs, damit ſie an den Iſraeliten tyranney geübt "hatten."—This idea he ſeems to have borrowed from the Thargums, in which we find the following paraphraſe: ארום בפתנמה דארשיעו מצראי למידן ית ישראל במיא' עלידהן הדר דינא לאיתרנא במיא. the meaning of which is, that as the Egyptians had wickedly made water the inſtrument of deſtroying the Hebrew children, the God of the Hebrews makes now uſe of the ſame element to avenge himſelf of them.—I wonder that this quaint notion ſhould be adopted by Hezel *.—I am perſuaded that Jethro never thought of any ſuch refinement.

We have ſeen what ſhifts have been uſed to give the words any tolerable meaning, as they now ſtand; but let them be tranſpoſed to the end of ver. 10, or mentally referred thither, and all will be clear, without any ſupplement or alteration. See my verſion.—Nehemiah had evidently in view this very paſſage, and underſtood it as I do, when, in his prayer, ch. 9. ver. 9 and 10, he ſays: "Thou ſaweſt the affliction of our forefathers in Egypt, and heardeſt their "cry at the Red-ſea; and ſhewedſt ſigns and wonders on Pharaoh and on all his ſervants, and "on all the people of his land: becauſe thou kneweſt *that they had dealt haughtily with them.*" כי הזידו עליהם; the very terms uſed here by Jethro. The *Egyptians* then are the nominative

"Nunc denique intelligo, Jovam omnium deorum eſſe maximum, et illis, propter eorum in vos ſuperbiam, merito ac-"cidiſſe." But this is making, not giving, a meaning to the words of the Text.—Diodati: "Conſcio fia coſa ch'egli "*fia* ſopra loro in quello ſteſſo di che eſſi inſuperbiſcono."—Luther was content to follow the Vulgate.—Le Gros thus: "Puiſqu'il *a fait retomber* ſur ces orgueilleux *la peine de* leur inſolence." * Jethro (ſays he) ſcheint hiermit auf diejenige verordnung des Pharao zu zielen, vermöge welcher alle neugeborne Iſraelitiſche knäblein ins waſſer geworfen und ersäuft werden ſollten, um die allzuſtarke vermehrung der Iſraeliten dadurch zu hindern. Jethro würde alſo ſagen: Jova habe ſeine allmacht, gröſſe und erhabenheit über alle andere götter, und zugleich auch ſeine weiſheit dadurch bewieſen, daſs er gerade dasjenige mittel (das waſſer) gebraucht habe, Pharao und ſeine ganze armee aufzureiben, deſſen ſich Pharao vergeblich bedient hatte, um die vermehrung der Iſraeliten zu hindern.

to

to *dealt haughtily;* and, whether the colon be tranſpoſed or not, it muſt neceſſarily be referred to them.

Ver. 13—27. From this very remarkable paſſage we may learn, I think, three things.—1ſt. That Moſes had luckily made alliance with a moſt ſenſible family, in which while he lived, he muſt have greatly improved his ſtock of Egyptian learning. 2dly. That the advice here given by Jethro, and adopted by Moſes, ſuppoſes that neither Jethro nor Moſes conſidered the latter ſo immediately under the direction of Heaven as not to ſtand in need of human counſel. 3dly. From the words, ver. 20. "Teach them his ſtatutes and laws, and ſhew them "the way in which they are to walk," we may preſume that Moſes took the hint of giving to the Iſraelites fixed and determinate laws, in the name of Jehovah. Moſes himſelf alludes to this, when, in his rehearſal of the ſtory, Deut. 1. 9—18. he concludes thus:—"At the "ſame time" (that is, before leaving Horeb,) "I inſtructed you in all that ye were to do:" that is, I gave you a general code of laws, by which ye might know how to regulate your conduct.

Ver. 23. *(God ſo ordaining.)* Although I have ſo rendered the words וצוך אלהים, I am not ſure that I have rightly rendered. Perhaps the Text is corrupted. The Septuagint ſeem to have read ועוך inſtead of וצוך, as they render κατισχυσε σε ὁ Θεος, *God will ſtrengthen thee:* a meaning perfectly ſuitable to the context *. But, even if the preſent reading be genuine, the common rendering of it is, perhaps, improper; and a better verſion of the verſe might be: "If this thou wilt do, then when God commandeth *any thing*, thou ſhalt be able, &c."—Equivalent to this are the verſions of Houbigant, Michaëlis, and Dathe, whoſe paraphraſe is: "Si hoc feceris, tum Deus tibi mandata ſua dare poteſt, tum tu *eis exſequendis* pareris, "&c."

CHAP. XIX.

Ver. 3. *Went up to God.* עלה אל האלהים. So both Texts †, with all the Ant. Verſions, ſave Sep. which has, in all the copies, εις το ορος του Θεου: and I am much inclined to think that this is the genuine reading. The Tharg. of Babylon ſays, he went to the top of the mountain, לריש טוורא. In the ſame verſe, I prefer the reading of moſt Greek copies, Syr. and one Heb. MS. which have *God* inſtead of *the Lord.* The Compl. ed. of Sep. has both: Κυριος ὁ Θεος.

Ver. 9. *In a thick cloud.* בעב הענן. So all the copies and verſions, ſave Sep. which have εν στυλῳ νεφελης. They read בעמוד inſtead of בעב. The laſt part of this verſe has ſo much the appearance of an interpolation, that I once thought of throwing it into the margin; but as it is in all the copies and verſions, I was unwilling to reject it; and by the turn which I have given it in my verſion, the tautology, I truſt, is hardly perceptible.

* The Syr. haa alſo been quoted as corroborating this reading; becauſe his Latin tranſlator in the Polyglott has rendered מפקו by *roboravit.* But this is not the only miſtranſlation in that Latin verſion. The Syr. muſt have read as the preſent Heb. and Sam. Texts, and all the other Ant. Verſions; except, perhaps, the Vulg. which thus paraphraſes the colon: *Si hoc feceris implebis imperium Dei, et præcepta ejus poteris ſuſtentare.* By what rules of tranſlating, all this could be hammered out of the preſent Text, it is hard to gueſs. † Although the Latin tranſlator of Sam. has wrongly *ad Dominum.*

Ver. 13. *On the ceaſing of the trumpet.* במשך היובל. Rendered in our common verſion: *When the trumpet ſoundeth long.* "But this verſion," remarks well the author of Commentaries, &c. "conveys not the meaning of the original, but is quite inconſiſtent with what is "ſaid in the former verſe, and afterward . . : . I ſuſpect an error in the word במשך. Three "Sam. MSS. have במושך part. Hophal, from שכך, *ſedari, quieſcere.* So the Syr. underſtood "it; and the LXX and Chald. are agreeable to this ſenſe." That Sep. and Syr. conſidered משך, or מושך, as a part of the verb שכך, there is little doubt, as the former renders *απελθη*, and the latter שתקת: but the מיגר of Onkelos is badly rendered by his Latin tranſlator by *ſubſtracta:* not ſo by the tranſlator of Tharg. where the ſame Chaldee word is properly rendered *intendetur.* Chald. then is to be claſſed with thoſe interpreters who conſider משך, or, as 7 MSS. משוך, as the infinitive of the verb משך. But the Gr. and Syr. reading being ſo agreeable to ſenſe and the context, I have no heſitation in preferring it *.

Ib. *Then may they come up.* The word *they,* המה, or הם, is thought by ſome interpreters to denote only the chiefs of the people; namely, Aaron, Nadab, Abihu, and the ſeventy elders mentioned ch. 24. 1.: as if God ſaid, "When the trumpet ceaſeth, then may *theſe,*" i. e. ſuch and ſuch perſons, "come up."—I ſee no foundation for ſuch a diſtinction; and ſuppoſe that, after the ceaſing of the trumpet, any of the Iſraelites *might,* if they choſe it, go up towards the mountain; for it is a permiſſion only, and not an order.

Ver. 15. *Approach not a woman.* אל תגשו אל אשה. Dr. Kennicott imagined that אשה is here for האש, and renders *come not near unto the fire;* meaning the fiery cloud which covered Mount-Sinai; "as the phraſe," ſays he, "*approach not a woman,* is not at all probable."—But why is it not probable? It is well known that carnal commerce with a woman was accounted a ſort of impurity, not only among the Jews, but among almoſt all the eaſtern nations; and a temporary abſtinence from it was deemed a neceſſary part of religious duty. See Herodotus, Clio. 198. and Euterp. 61.—Nay, the ſame ſuperſtition was long foſtered by the Chriſtian prieſthood; and abſtinence from the marriage-bed is ſtill recommended to communicants.

Ver. 22. *Let the prieſts, even, who approach to the Lord, ſanctify themſelves,* &c. No legal prieſthood was yet eſtabliſhed; who then were the prieſts here mentioned? In my Explan. Note I have ſaid that they were probably the elders of the people, who, like the more antient patriarchs, offered ſacrifices for their families and dependents. Le Clerc, and others, think that *the young men* mentioned ch. 24. 5. are the prieſts here deſigned.

Ver. 25. *And told them.* What? Doubtleſs all that God had ordered concerning them.—But Houbigant imagined that the words את כל הדברים האלה have been dropped out of the

* The ingenious Lobſtein gives a ſingular turn to this paſſage, which he calls the *croſs of critics.* Adopting the reading of his favourite Genovefan MS. of the Sam. Text, he reaſons thus: "Convertamus משך in nomen מֵשֶׁךְ, quod *electionem* "ſignificat Job. 18. 18. יבל vero, ſeu ejus decurtatum בגל (*jod* per aphaereſin abjecto) a radice יבל derivatum, denotat "quodlibet *proventûs* genus, ſive graminis; Lev. 14. 4. ſive *vitis;* Hab. 3. 16.; ſive *arboris;* Iſa. 44. 19. Ergo: *ramum,* "ſeu *baculum;* hinc metaphoricè *tribum,* uti vox משה . . . . Unde jam metonymicè *ſigno* pro *re ſignata* poſito, baculi "Num. 17. 2. quibus nomina tribuum inſcripta fuere, pro ipſis *tribulus* venire ſolent. Ergo, ſecundum lectionem Sam. "Genovefenſem hæc juſta foret interpretatio: *Secundum electionem tribulem qui ſunt, illi vero adſcendant in montem.*"—There are few, I believe, who will reliſh ſuch metaphors and metonymies; and, if the Genovefan MS. has no greater claim to the palm (palmam præripere) than ſuch readings as this, its claim is not urgent.

Text;

Text; or that theſe words in ch. 20. 1. belonged originally to ch. 19. and that ch. 20. ſhould commence with וידבר אלהים לאמר: ſo that the whole ſhould run thus: "So Moſes went down "from the mountain unto the people, and told them all theſe words .... And the Lord ſpoke, "ſaying, I am, &c." His reaſon is, becauſe האלה is uſed only to expreſs what had preceded; but this is a miſtake, into which it is ſtrange ſuch a critic as Houbigant ſhould fall.

CHAP. XX.

HITHERTO Moſes had given to the Iſraelites no permanent written laws: he had guided them by occaſional injunctions, ſaid to be communicated to him by Jehovah; but the many difficulties which daily aroſe, and the various applications that were conſtantly made by ſo numerous a people to know the will of Heaven, produced the excellent counſel of Jethro; to the fulfilling of which the ſapient lawgiver now bends his whole great mind. Nothing could be better conceived, or more dexterouſly executed, than the plan which he adopts to give a ſanction to the precepts he was about to promulge. The higheſt top of Sinai, where he was ſuppoſed to have received his firſt miſſion, is pitched upon as the ſecret ſanctuary where he is to meet the Deity, and receive from him a new code of laws, to be ever after obſerved by the Hebrew nation, as coming from their own peculiar God. The people, firſt purified by ablutions and abſtinence from connubial pleaſures, are forbidden under pain of death to approach the mountain; and the prieſts themſelves, who might approach it to offer ſacrifice, are inhibited from aſcending to its ſummit. Order is added to order, and caution to precaution, for the purpoſe of preventing the ſmalleſt infringement of this injunction. While the people wait thus, in awe and anxious expectation, a ſtorm of thunder and lightning enſues. This, they are told, is the voice of God; who, meanwhile, is ſuppoſed to give to Moſes, in words articulate, the Decalogue, or Ten Commandments.

Such I conceive to be the whole myſtery. But as my conceptions are only mine own, others are welcome to conceive of it as they pleaſe; and literally to believe that Jehovah really *ſpoke all thoſe words*.

There are few grammatical difficulties in this chapter. The following are worthy of ſome notice.

Ver. 4. *Carved* idol. There is only one word in the original, פסל; well rendered by Jerom *ſculptile*, and λαξευμα by Gr. Ven. But as it is evident that it is not the mere making or uſing ſtatues or images that is here forbidden, the Septuagint render not improperly ειδωλον, which I have added in Italic characters in my verſion. Nothing could be more ridiculous than the violent declamations of Proteſtants againſt the uſe of images in the Romiſh church, and the application of this precept to that uſe: although, on the other hand, it muſt be confeſſed, that the *uſe* has ſometimes been turned into an *abuſe* bordering on idolatry.

It may be proper here to obſerve, that in the diviſion of the Decalogue, the Chriſtian churches are not agreed. The church of England, and the whole body of Calviniſts, with Joſephus, make two diſtinct precepts of ver. 3—7.; whereas the Roman Catholics, and moſt Lutherans, divide with St. Auſtin, and make one commandment of what the former make two; but, to keep up

the number of *ten*, they ſplit what, in the other diviſion, is deemed the *ninth* commandment. It is of ſo little importance, that I wonder it ever could beget a controverſy *. Yet it has not only begotten vehement controverſies, but unfounded miſrepreſentations on the part of Proteſtants; who maintained that the Papiſts had thrown the ſecond commandment out of the Decalogue †, becauſe it condemned their image-worſhip. For the reſt, the ſpecification in ver. 4. alludes clearly to the worſhip of the Egyptians, who had deities in all the three elements of *air*, *earth*, and *water*.

Ver. 7. *Thou ſhalt not apply the name of the Lord, thy God, to a falſehood.* I have not rendered, with our common verſion, "Thou ſhalt not take the name of the Lord, thy God, in "vain;" becauſe I am perſuaded that this is not the real meaning of לא תשא את שם יהוה אלהיך לשוא. The meaning is well expreſſed by Syr.: לא אמא בשמה דמריא אלהך כד גלותא, *Thou ſhalt not lyingly ſwear by the Lord, thy God.* To the ſame purport Onk. Tharg. both Arabs, and admirably Gr. Ven.: Ουκ αρεις τ'ονομα του οντωτου, του Θεου σου, εις ψευδος.—A ſimilar and juſt verſion I find in Biſhop Law's MS. Notes: "Thou ſhalt not uſe the name of the Lord, thy "God, in a falſehood ‡." Comp. Deut. 5. 19. where עד שוא is *a falſe teſtimony*, μαρτυριαν ψευδης.

Ver. 13. The Greek copies vary in the order of this and the two next commandments. The Rom ed. has ου μοχευσεις—ου κλεψεις—ου φονευσεις. The Oxford MS. ου μοχευσεις—ου φονευσεις—ου κλεψεις §. But all the other editions, with Glaſg. Ambroſ. Canon. and the Copt. and Ital. verſions, follow the order of the Hebrew: and ſo all the other ant. verſions, and even all the copies of Sep. in P. P. Deut. 5. 17. except the Ox. MS. which has ου μοχευσεις firſt.

Ver. 17. At the end of this verſe is a large addition in the Sam. copy, which, in my verſion, I have thrown out of the Text, as probably an interpolation; adding, in my Note, that perhaps it is the only one of any note that is to be found in the Samaritan exemplar. My principal reaſon for this ſuſpicion aroſe from the conſideration, that, at this period of the hiſtory, it was not certain that the Iſraelites would enter into Chanaan from the Eaſt acroſs the Jordan, ſince we learn from Num. 13. that it was the intention of Moſes to go up from the wilderneſs of Pharan acroſs the mountains: conſequently the Lord could not, before that period, be made to ſay, that "Mount Garizim was beyond the Jordan." But on further reflection, and after a more comprehenſive view of the whole hiſtory of the Pentateuch, I am now inclined to think that the reaſon is not ſo urgent as may at firſt ſight appear. The recorder of the precept might have in view what was to happen, not what might have happened: and the ſame precept being repeated in Deut. 27. 1. when the Iſraelites were in the plains of Moab,

* On the diſtribution of the Decalogue, ſee Voſſius, tom. vi. p. 450. † What ſeems to have given riſe to this was, the whole commandment having, in elementary catechiſms, been thus abridged: "Thou ſhalt have no other Gods "but me, &c.:" in the ſame manner as the precept concerning the ſabbath is frequently abridged into "Remember to "keep holy the ſabbath-day, &c." ‡ So Dathe: *Ne enuncies nomen Jovæ, Dei tui, in mendacii aſſeverationem.*—Roſenmüller: *Non proferes nomen Jovæ, Dei tui, ad falſum* comprobandum.—Hezel: "Du ſolt den namen des Herrn, "deines Gottes, nicht zum falſum ausſprechen." § Mark, 10. 19. and Paul in his Ep. to the Romans, 13. 9. quote them in the ſame order: but Matthew, 19. 18. follows the Hebrew; "which may argue," ſays Secker, "his "Goſpel to have been firſt written in Hebrew."

it

it was natural to make both orders concordant to that latter ſituation.—For a further illuſtration of this ſubject, I muſt refer to my *Diſſertation on the Sam. Pentateuch.*

Ver. 18. *Now the whole people heard*, &c. The Text has וכל העם ראים. Lit. *et omnis populus videntes:* a collective ſingular noun, with a plural participle: and ſo read all the ant. verſions. But the Sam. inſtead of ראים, has שמע, *audivit*; which I have followed in my verſion. Yet I would not ſay that the other is not a very probable reading. The metaphor of expreſſing what we *hear* by *ſeeing* is not uncommon. So Sophocles in Oedip. col. 136. φωνη γαρ ὁρω, κ. τ. λ.

Ver. 21. In no where is the ſuperiority of the Sam. Text more apparent than here. The addition which follows this verſe is wanting in the Hebrew copies and all the verſions: yet Moſes, in his rehearſal of this very tranſaction, Deut. 5. 28—31. refers to this very ſpeech; although he repeats not the whole of it. And indeed, without it, the Text is evidently bald, and ill connected.

Ver. 22. *Ye have ſeen, that from the heavens I have talked with you.* From theſe expreſſions, and from Deut. 5. 22. it has been inferred, that the words of the whole Decalogue were articulately pronounced by the voice of God; and I doubt not but I ſhall be deemed an impious unbeliever for calling the thing in queſtion. But I am not apt to be frightened by hard words. I am not, indeed, a great believer; but I am not impious. I ſincerely believe in God, and endeavour to worſhip *him in ſpirit and in truth:* but I cannot think, that, excellent in moſt reſpects as the Decalogue is, every word of it was articulately uttered by the mouth of God. If there was any articulate voice heard on the occaſion, I am perſuaded it was the voice of man; ſpeaking, perhaps, through a trumpet, during the formidable thunder and lightning which then occaſionally took place. But even this is not neceſſarily implicable from the Text, if we ſtrip it of its highly poetical varniſh, and have ever in view the Oriental modes of phraſeology, ſo different from ours, and ſo replete with metaphorical perſonifications *. The great point with Moſes was, to make his people believe that all his laws were communicated to him by Jehovah; and in this, according to his hiſtorian, he certainly took the moſt effectual meaſures to ſucceed. Yet we find that his divine miſſion was more than once doubted by the beſt informed of the Iſraelites; and it required ſeveral new, real or pretended, miracles, to remove their doubts. But if perſons who had been ear and eye witneſſes to all the miracles already performed, doubted of their ſufficiency to eſtabliſh the divine legation of Moſes, it may ſurely be lawful for us, who have neither ſeen nor heard, to queſtion their veracity, for which we have no other vouchers but an anonymous narrative, compoſed we know not when nor by whom; for it can never be proved, by any ſolid ſatisfactory arguments, to be the compoſition of Moſes. But were it allowed to be, every word of it, the compoſition of Moſes himſelf, that alone would not be a ſufficient reaſon for implicitly believing all its contents. Reaſon bids us appreciate the writings of a Moſes as we appreciate the writings of a Livy or an Herodotus; and the ſame or ſimilar motives of credibility or incredibility ought to be the meaſure of our belief or diſbelief in the former as in the latter; for, in this reſpect, I ſee no difference between a Hebrew hiſtorian and a Greek or Roman hiſtorian.

* See a very curious little work of Hezel's, called *Orion*; or an account of it in the Analytical Review.

Ver. 23. *Beſide me.* אתי, *mecum.* But the word is wanting in one of Kennicott's MSS. nor is it rendered by Jerom or Saadias. The Septuagint ſeem to have read לכם, unleſs they ſupplied it here from the end of the verſe: however, they did not read, or they neglected, אתי. Ου ποιησετε υμιν αυτοις θεους αργυρους, και θεους χρυσους ου ποιησετε υμιν αυτοις. There is ſome variety of reading in the copies; but none of them has any word for אתי; and indeed the Text is better without it. If it be a part of the Text, it may be rendered either *beſide me*, or *in oppoſition to me.* But perhaps את is here the ſign of the accuſative caſe; and the meaning of the precept may be: "Thou ſhalt not make me a god of ſilver, &c." i. e. Thou ſhalt not repreſent me by any ſenſible image. Comp. Deut. 4. 12 and 15.

CHAP. XXI.

Ver. 6. *Before the magiſtrates.* Lit. *Before the gods.* But it has been already obſerved that the term gods אלהים is often applied to great perſonages, judges, magiſtrates, &c.

Ver. 8. *That he will not betroth her.* There is a various reading here of a ſingle monoſyllable, but which gives a quite contrary meaning, followed by our tranſlators: "Who hath "betrothed her to himſelf." All the Sam. copies and the printed Hebrew Text have the negative particle לא; and ſo read Aq. Theod. Sym. Syr. both Arabs. Perſ. Gr. Ven. and, moſt probably, the Septuagint *.

On the other hand, the *Keri*, with 5 or 6 Heb. MSS. Onk. † and Vulg. have לו, *ſibi*; which reading, ſays Dathe, ſeems to be preferable: "Propter ultima verba בבגדו בה *quod fidem* "*datam ei fallat:* igitur promiſerat ei matrimonium." This inference, to me, appears unjuſt. Whoever reads the context with any attention muſt, I think, be perſuaded, that the Textual is the true reading. "Lectio textualis," ſays Roſenmüller, "ob majoris auctoritatis teſtes, et "ob meliorem ſenſum, videtur præferenda." So Houbigant, *quia ipſam non deſponſârit:*— and Michaëlis: "So daſs er ſie nicht für ſich beſtimmet."—For the reſt, I render בבגדו בה; not "becauſe he hath dealt deceitfully with her;" but *becauſe he deſpiſeth her*; with Sep. and Vulg. ὁτι ηθετησεν εν αυτῃ—*ſi ſpreverit eam.* Not badly Houbigant: *cum animo erit in eam alieno.* But better Michaëlis, by a ſlight tranſpoſition: "Verachtet er ſie, ſo iſt er nicht berechtiget, "ſie unter ein fremdes volk zu verkaufen."

Ver. 13. *If he do it not premeditately.* ואשר לא צדה. In our public verſion rendered, after Vulg.: "And if a man lie not in wait." But צדה nowhere ſignifies *to lie in wait*; *but to act with deſign.* Sep. ουχ ἑκων: and ſo equivalently both Arabs, Perſ. and the Sam. verſion ‡.

* De Roſſi and Dathe claſs Sep. on the other ſide, on the authority of the Complutenſian and Roman editions; of which the former has ἡν αυτος καθομολογησατο αυτην, the latter ἡ αυτῳ καθωμολογησατο: but they ſhould have noticed that Ald. and Alex. have ἡν ου καθωμολογησατο; with which agree Glaſg. Canon. and, I doubt not, other MSS. To theſe add the Copt. and Italic verſions: ſo that, on the whole, we may account it the genuine lection of Sep.

† But 13 of De Roſſi's Chald. MSS. read with the negative. ‡ Schultens, who was continually hunting for new meanings from the Arabic, imagined that צדה was to be derived from צדא, *to be ruſty*; metaphorically, *to have a malevolent mind.* Michaëlis likewiſe derives it from the ſame root, but in the ſignification of *thirſting*; as if the meaning were, *but if he thirſt not*, i. e. for *blood.* I wonder Dathe could adopt this idea, whoſe verſion is: *Qui vero alterius ſanguinem non ſitierit.* Much better Houbigant: *Quod ſi non ex conſilio egerit.*

Ver.

Ver. 16. Is rightly placed in Sep. after ver. 17. This, and the addition " of the children " of Iſrael," ſhews the great value of that moſt antient verſion; for we find the ſame precept ſo given in Deut. 24. 7. מבני ישראל.

Ib. *Secreteth him.* והתעמר בו. See the Rem. on Deut.

Ver. 18. *Or his fiſt.* באגרף. Sep. πυγμῃ. Vulg. *pugno*; followed by our Engliſh and moſt modern tranſlators. But Onk. Tharg. and Syr. have words that denote a *ſtick, rod, club:* כורמיוא—מרתוקא—חטרא. Saad. שאדה, which ſeems to denote any thing *that bruiſes.* Arab. Erp. תראבה, which in Walton's Dictionary is rendered *pugnus*; but I doubt very much if it admit that meaning. Michaëlis would derive it from תראב, *duſt*; and thinks it means a *corn-ſhovel*; " pala, ſed ferro munita; inſtrumentum ruſticum quod rixantibus ſtatim ad manus " erat." I rather think that it has the ſame meaning with Perſ. כלוה, which denotes *a clod of hard earth*; *gleba:* and this is not at all unſuitable to the Text. It may mean any thing hard compounded of *earth*, in oppoſition to *ſtone*; ſuch as an earthen *bowl*, or a *brick-bat*. However, as the real meaning is dubious, (the word occurring but twice,) I have retained the word *fiſt*, chiefly on the authority of Sep. with whom it is remarkable that Gr. Ven agrees: εν πυγμῃ. The verſions of Aq. Theod. and Sym. are loſt. In all the Sam. copies of the Text the words באבן או באגרף are wanting.

Ver. 22. *With apologies.* בפללים. By Jerom rendered *quantum arbitri judicaverint*; and in our public verſion, " as the judges ſhall determine." So, equivalently, Onk. Tharg. Syr. Arab. Erp. * Perſ. and Gr. Ven. But ſuch a conſtruction is harſh and unuſual; and I am perſuaded that Sep. and the Sam. tranſlator have given the true meaning—μετ' αξιωματος—בצלואן, *deprecationibus.*

Ver. 25. *Burning for burning.* כויה תחת כויה, *aduſtio pro aduſtione.* It denotes a *brand*, or *ſtigma*, by hot iron, or the like.

CHAP. XXII.

Ver. 3. *If he have not wherewith* to reſtore, &c. That this relates to theft in general, and not to the caſe immediately preceding, is clear from the context. The caſe of the houſebreaker ends at ישלם, where the point ſhould be. So the Septuagint well underſtood it: ενοχος εστιν, αντιποθανειται. Εαν δε μη, κ. τ. λ. So alſo Vulg.: *homicidium perpetravit, et ipſe morietur. Si non habuerit*, &c. To make the words אם אין לו, &c. apply to the houſebreaking thief, our interpreters have been obliged to give to שלם ישלם a turn which they cannot bear; namely, " *the houſebreaking thief* would have been obliged to make full reſtitution; and if he had not, " &c.:" than which a more forced and unnatural explication can hardly be conceived; and all this to ſave the credit of the Maſoretic punctuation. But if, by a very common *ſynchyſis*, the words אם אין לו be referred to the general term *thief*, all is clear, and the Text conſonant with itſelf.

Ver. 13. *He ſhall bring a proof of the tearing.* יביא עד הטרפה. For ſo rightly Sam. †, and

* Saadias has באנצאף, *according to juſtice.* † The preſent Heb. has יבאהו, but above 30 MSS. have, better, יביאהו; and one has יבא on a raſure, which concords with the Sam. reading if a *hirik* be ſupplied.

ſo

ſo read Onk. Syr. both Arabs, and Perſ. The Septuagint, however, ſeem to have read as the preſent Hebrew, but conſidered עד as a prepoſition, *αξει αυτον επι την θηραν* *, "he ſhall "bring him" (that is, the owner of the beaſt) "to the ſpot where his beaſt had been torn :" (if *θηρα* here be not *the wild beaſt itſelf.*) Jerom likewiſe took עד for a prepoſition, but ſeems to have read differently from the reſt, or to have been puzzled about the meaning of his Text, as he renders *Si comeſtum a beſtia, deferat ad eum quod occiſum eſt, et non reſtituet :* tranſlated by the Douay divines thus: "If he were eaten of a beaſt, let him bring unto him (the owner) that "which was ſlain, and he ſhall not make reſtitution." But nothing is ſo clear as the Sam. reading, to which even the Hebrew Text, by a different punctuation, is reducible. Remove the *athnach* from עד, and read, with two MSS. and moſt of the antients, ולא after עד; and the Text, properly pointed, יביאהו עד הטרפה ולא ישלם, will give the literal verſion: *Et adducet id, teſtimonium raptûs; et non rependet.* Although I ſtill think the Sam. reading more ſimple and preferable. Houbigant follows the Septuagint: "Sin autem fuerit a feris diſcerptum, adducet "eum ad locum ubi animal jacebit; neque reddet."—The good ſenſe of Luther, without the aid of the Sam. made him neglect the Maſoretic punctuation, and his tranſlation is conſequently excellent: "Wird es aber zerriſſen, ſo ſoll er zeugniſs davon bringen, und nicht "bezalen:" *Has it been torn, he ſhall bring teſtimony thereof, and ſhall not repay.* I wonder that Dathe and Michaëlis divided and rendered otherwiſe.

CHAP. XXIII.

Ver. 5. *Ye ſhall not withhold your aſſiſtance, but ſhall ſurely help up with him.* The words of the Text are וחדלת מעזב לו׳ עזב תעזב עמו, which are thus barbarouſly rendered by Montanus: *Et ceſſabis a deſerendo ei; deſerendo deſeres cum eo.* Our Engliſh tranſlators: "and "wouldeſt forbear to help him, thou ſhalt ſurely help with him." But this is wreſting the Hebrew to a ſenſe it will not bear; for עזב never ſignifies *to help*; but, on the contrary, *to forſake.* Purver tried his ſkill to give a more literal meaning thus: ... *and by forſaking doſt let him alone, thou ſhalt be utterly forſaken with him:*—an odd method truly to explain a Text. Others have taken other methods equally fanciful, which the reader may ſee in Bochart and in Poole. I ſhall notice only two: that of Sypkens, adopted by Dathe, and that of Michaëlis. According to the former, the meaning of the verſe will be: *Quando videris oſoris tui aſinum ſuccumbentem ſub onere ſuo, et volueris eum auxilio deſtituere, quo minus vincla ei relaxes, relaxando relaxabis cum eo:* but how this, without much ſtraining, can be brought out of the Hebrew, I confeſs myſelf at a loſs to ſee. Michaelis thus: "Siehſt du den eſel deines feindes "unter der laſt erliegen, ſo ſollſt du nicht vorbey gehen, und ihn ſeinem herren hülflos über-"laſſen, ſondern du ſollſt angreifen, und ihn nicht eher, als der eigenthümer ſelbſt verlaſſen."

* So Rom. Ald. Alex. and Glaſg.; but Complut. *αξει αυτο επι την θυραν, et adducet id ad oſtium*; which Latin verſion has been retained in the London Polyglott, although it correſponds not with the Greek Text. Singular is the reading of MS. Canon.; *μαρτυραν* (for *μαρτυριαν*) *επι την θυραν*. This expreſſes the Hebrew עד as a noun, and was probably made by ſome corrector from the Hebrew copy: but why did he not alſo correct *θυραν*?—Perhaps ſome of Holmes's MSS. may give yet other readings.

This

This tranſlation, or paraphraſe, is founded on a ſuppoſed double meaning in the word עזב: firſt, *to leave a thing to* its lord; and, 2dly, *to leave a thing with* its lord.

But why ſo much ingenuity exerted to explain a Text which is viſibly corrupted, and out of which no one yet has been able to draw even a plauſible meaning? The original reading of the Text was, in my opinion, certainly not עזב, but עזר, in all the three places:—firſt emendation to be made. Then, inſtead of וחדלת, we ſhould read לא חדלת; or, with Le Clerc, (with Houbigant's good leave,) render interrogatively: "Wilt thou omit to help him?" And in either of theſe ways the ſenſe will be clear and conſiſtent. The *beth* and *reſh*, in the old Samaritan characters, reſemble each other as much as the *daleth* and *reſh* in the common Hebrew characters; and many inſtances of their having been interchanged might be pointed out. It is evident that the Septuagint muſt have had עזר in their copy, and that they read the negative before חדלת, ſince they render ου παρελευσῃ αυτο, αλλα συναρεις* αυτο μετ' αυτου. So likewiſe Jerom: *non pertranſibis, ſed ſublevabis cum eo.* The Text, thus amended, preſents no difficulty. Compare Deut. 22. 4.

Ver. 7. *For I will not acquit*, &c. כי לא אצדיק. So the Hebrew Text, with all the verſions, ſave Sep. which have και ου δικαιωσεις. They muſt have read תצדיק in the 2 Perſ. and ולא inſtead of כי לא. This is another preſumptive proof that they tranſlated from a MS. in Samaritan letters; for, in theſe, the *aleph* and *thau* are very much like one another. The preſent Sam. copies have הצדיק, which the Latin tranſlator renders *juſtificabitur*; but I doubt if the word will bear to be ſo tranſlated, and ſuſpect either that it is an error, or that it is in the imperative mood; and, in this caſe, it will coincide with Sep. The Sam. verſion has דלא לא זכאה עיב; which may be rendered, *ſed, ne purum pronunciato vitioſum.* There is here a ſmall addition in the Greek, which was omitted to be noticed among the various readings; namely, ενεκεν δωρων, *for the ſake of gifts*, or *bribes*. It is in all the printed editions, in the Glaſg. MS. and old Ital. but is wanting in Oxf. Canon. and in the Copt. verſion.

Ver. 8. *The eyes of the clear-ſighted.* Two MSS. for פקחים *clear-ſighted*, read חכמים *wiſe*; and this ſeems to have been the reading of Aq. Syr. Onk. and Vulg.; but Sep. both Arabs, Perſ. and Gr. Ven. had before them the common reading. The words, from ſimilarity of ſound, ſenſe, and characters, were eaſily interchanged. To the authorities marked among the Var. Readings for the addition of עיני, *the eyes*, add 7 printed editions of Onk. and 21 of De Roſſi's Chald. MSS.

Ver. 12. I have, with Houbigant, preferred the Sam. lection as the moſt natural, although all the verſions copy the other.

Ver. 13. *Whatſoever I ſay to you, ye ſhall obſerve*, &c. The preſent Text has ובכל, *and in whatſoever*, &c. But better the Sam. וכל, which was the firſt reading of one of De Roſſi's MSS. and was the reading of Syr. and Saad. and perhaps that of Sep. and Vulg. who ſometimes drop the copulative for the ſake of brevity, and to make the ſentence more emphatical. Houbigant thinks that the original reading was וככל; and this is by no means improbable. It is certainly a better reading than ובכל; and it was eaſy to miſtake a *caph* for a *beth*.

Ver. 17. *The Lord, your God.* I read, with Sep. Syr. Vulg. יהוה אלהיך, inſtead of האדון יהוה,

* So Rom.; but Ald. and Compl. have συνερεις, and Alex. εγερεις, in the ſame meaning.

which

which is in the preſent Hebrew. The Sam. Text has ואת־ארון, *before the* ARK *of the Lord*; and, if it be allowed that the precept is here given by anticipation, this is no improbable reading. Indeed, the whole tiſſue of ordinances here enjoined ſeem chiefly calculated for the people when they ſhould be ſettled in the land of Chanaan.

Ver. 18. There is in this verſe a grievous miſprint in my verſion: *unleavened* for *leavened*: which I requeſt the reader to correct.

Ver. 19. *Ye ſhall not cook a kid in the milk of its own mother.* This precept, which is again repeated ch. 34. 26. and Deut. 14. 21. has very much puzzled commentators. In both places of Exodus, it is placed immediately after the precepts concerning feſtivals, ſacrifices, and firſt-fruits; but, in Deuteronomy, with precepts that forbid the eating of unclean things: yet in neither of theſe poſitions is the motive or meaning readily conceived.

Philo, with whom accord Aben-Ezrah and other learned Jews, is of opinion, that the precept was given merely to teach the Iſraelites to abhor every ſpecies of cruelty: υπελαβεν δεινον, την τροφην ζωντος ηδυσμα γενεσθαι και παραρτυσιν αναιρεθεντος. Bochart was pleaſed with this interpretation.

Maimonides, who very properly ſeeks for the natural reaſons of the Moſaical injunctions, thought that a kid boiled in its mother's milk was prohibited as a groſs and unwholeſome food: but this is contrary to experience, unleſs boiling it in milk would render it ſo; for it is well known that the kid is both a tender and wholeſome nutriment.

Abarbanel, and others, think that the precept alludes to ſome ſuperſtitious rite uſed by the idolatrous nations in honour of their gods; and a Caraite Jew, quoted by Cudworth *, affirms, that it was cuſtomary among them to boil a kid in the milk of its mother, and with the decoction beſprinkle, in a magical manner, their fields and gardens; thinking, by this means, they ſhould make them fructify; which opinion was adopted by J. Gregorie †, and ſupported by Spencer ‡, by very ſpecious arguments. Theſe, however, have been ſpeciouſly combated by Michaëlis §, whoſe opinion is as follows.

Firſt, He takes it for granted that בשל may ſignify to *roaſt* as well as to *boil*; which is hardly diſputable; and, therefore, I have in my verſion uſed a general term, *cook*.—*Secondly*, That the kid's mother is here not to be limited to the real mother of any particular kid, but denotes any goat which has kidded.—*Thirdly*, That חלב here means not *milk*, but *butter*.—*Fourthly*, That the precept is not to be reſtricted to kids, but extends not only to lambs, (which is generally granted,) but to all other not forbidden animals.—Theſe props being erected, he builds on them his conjecture; namely, that the motive of the precept was, to endear to the Iſraelites the land of Chanaan, which abounded in *oil*, and make them forget their Egyptian *butter*. Moſes, therefore, to prevent their having any longing deſire to return to that country, enjoins them to uſe oil in cooking their victuals, as well as in ſeaſoning their ſacrifices.

It muſt be confeſſed that this is an ingenious hypotheſis. But is it well grounded?—I think not: for, in the firſt place, his ſecond, third, and partly his fourth, poſtulates cannot eaſily be granted. It is unnatural to extend the meaning of the kid's (or lamb's) mother to any

* In his Diſcourſe on the Lord's Supper, c. 2. † *Notes and Obſervations*, ch. 19. p. 92. ‡ *De Legibus Hebr.* l. 2. c. 9. ſect. 2. § In his *Moſaiſches Recht*, part iv. p. 210, of the ſecond ed. and in a memoir entitled *Commentatio de Legibus Moſis Iſraeliticis Paleſtinam caram facturis*, ſect. 10.

other

other goat or ewe; there is no proof that חלב ever ſignifies *butter*; and, although גדי includes the lamb *, to extend it to all other clean animals is too great a ſtretch. But, in the ſecond place, were all this granted, the concluſion would not, in my conception, be juſt. There was no need, nor temptation, for the Iſraelites to long to return to Egypt on account of its butter, when they poſſeſſed a country that flowed with *milk* and honey. Among the various modes of roaſting meat in the Eaſt, which the reader may ſee in Harmer †, I find not that either oil or butter is uſed: and indeed roaſt meat is rarely eaten by them. There is no good reaſon then to turn בשל from its common acceptation, nor to convert *milk* into *butter*, for the ſake of eſtabliſhing an hypotheſis which is otherwiſe improbable. Were I to adopt any part of Michaëlis's theory, I would ſay that חלב here, as often elſewhere, denotes not *milk*, but *fat*; and that the precept forbids the uſe of *greaſe* in cooking victuals, ſince *oil* might be more wholeſomely employed for that purpoſe.

On the whole, I cannot but, with Le Clerc and Dathe, greatly prefer the interpretation of Spencer, which is corroborated by the addition in the Sam. copy ‡, and in ſome degree by the Thargums §. For, granting that the Thargums are of no great authority, and that the Sam. addition is an interpolation, it is clear, at leaſt, that when the Thargums were compoſed, and when the interpolation was made, both Jews and Samaritans were of opinion that the precept alluded to ſome abominable rite, which was meant to be proſcribed.

I once thought, and have ſince found that others had ſo thought before me, that the words might be rendered thus: "Ye ſhall not cook a kid while it is on its mother's milk:" i. e. during the period neceſſary both for its own nutrition and the eaſe of its dam; for it is well known that all females, for ſome time after parturition, are oppreſſed with their milk. Accordingly we find, Exod. 22. 30. that even the firſtlings that were to be offered to the Lord were ordered not to be ſevered from their mothers until the eighth day. Gregorie imagined that the Perſic tranſlator favoured this interpretation; but he neither well expreſſes, nor properly renders, the Perſic; which is not נה גושתני בצה דרשיזר מדריאו, but נה גושאני בחה דר שירי מאדרי או; nor does the verb גושאנדן ſignify to *kill*, but to *boil*, or *cook*. Yet ſtill I deem the interpretation probable, becauſe it is founded on a natural cauſe, and excludes typic meanings. Another natural motive might be, the revolting idea of boiling or cooking a kid in the very liquor that ought to have nouriſhed it; and this, by ſome, has been thought a ſufficient explanation of the precept.—Let the reader now judge for himſelf.

Ver. 20. *Lo, mine angel I ſend before you.* I follow the Sam. reading, מאלכי, which was that of Sep. and Vulg. *τον αγγελον μου—angelum meum.* It muſt have alſo been read by Perſ. who has פרשתתי מן; but not by Onk. although his Latin tranſlator has *angelum meum.* But who is this angel? Some will have it to be Moſes himſelf; but whoever has compared the parallel places, ch. 14. 19; 32. 34; 33. 2, 14; and Num. 20. 16; muſt be ſatisfied that this cannot be the caſe. Others, with equal reaſon, ſay it was Joſhuah. But moſt Chriſtian inter-

* The Septuagint ſo render it here: *ουχ ἑψησεις αρνα εν γαλακτι μητρος αυτου.* † Vol. i. p. 217, 316, 327, 329. ‡ "For he who doth this is like a man who ſacrificeth an abomination; and it is a treſpaſs againſt the "God of Jacob." § O my people! houſe of Iſrael! it is not lawful for you to boil or eat fleſh and milk mixed together, leſt my wrath be enkindled, and I *boil* your products, corn and ſtraw, together.—There is a play upon the word בשל.

preters explain it of Jesus, the Messiah; and bring the Jew Philo as an evidence of great weight in favour of this opinion *: but I, who have read Philo with some attention, find nothing in the passage but a personification of God's wisdom or providence, in the same sense in which it is often used by the authors of the Books of Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus, the former of which hath by some been ascribed to Philo himself.

The apostle Paul has also been adduced as a guarantee for this opinion; because, in his First Epistle to the Corinthians, ch. 10. 9. he says, "Neither let us tempt Christ, as some of "them also tempted, &c." But, besides that Paul is here allegorizing, and accommodating events of the Hebrew history to the times of the Gospel, it is not certain that *Christ* is here the genuine reading. The Alexandrian MS. and the Ethiopic version have *God* instead of *Christ*. Granting even *Christ* to be the true reading, it would not follow that *him* is to be understood after *as some of them tempted:* we may as well supply God from ver. 5. At any rate, it is a poor argument to prove that the *angel* mentioned in Exod. was Jesus Christ. Nay, the meaning is clear, from ch. 33. 14. where the same that is here called God's *angel* is called his *presence*; פני ילכו, *My presence* shall go, &c.; i. e. My providence shall attend you. But the Hebrews were then too carnal and gross a people to have an adequate idea of the nature, omnipresence, and particular providence, of the Deity; and therefore their legislator was obliged to make God speak to them in a language more suited to their capacities †.—I had almost forgotten to mention, that some take the angel here to be the same with the pillar of fire, ch. 16. 19, 20. So Hezel; to which I can by no means subscribe.

Ver. 27. *I will dismay.* והמתי: Sep. εκστησω, I will *stupify*; and so Saad. אהים: but Vulg. *occidam*; and so equivalently Syr. אחרוב, and Arab. Erp. אקתל. Onk. and Tharg. אשגש, *I will put in disorder:* and so Pers. Gr. Ven. επιταραξω. Our last translators rendered *I will destroy*; but in Cranmer's Bible it is *I will trouble:* a much better version; for the context shews that the word cannot here mean to *destroy*, but to *trouble, intimidate, dismay*, so as to make them *turn their backs* to the Israelites. That Schultens was right in deriving the word from the Arabic הם, *liquefacere*, is confirmed by a passage in Joshuah, 2. 9. where Rahab says to the spies: "The dread of you hath fallen on us, and all the inhabitants of the land are dispi- "rited (lit. *melt*) at your approach:" and again, ver. 21. "Every man's courage failed him;" lit. *our heart was melted*; ימס לבבנו. Here *terror* and *liquefaction* are joined together as in Exod. and the one place is a proper commentary on the other.

Ver. 28. *I will send hornets.* Lit. *I will send the hornet*—את הצרעה; as elsewhere את הארבה, *the locust*, for *locusts*.—Although, in rendering צרעה, I have followed Sep. and most of the antient versions ‡, I doubt very much of the propriety of this translation. We no-

* His words are: Καθαπερ γαρ τινα ποιμνην, γην και ὑδωρ και αερα και πυρ, και ὁσα εν τουτοις φυτα τε αυ και ζωα, τα μεν θνητα τα δε θεια, ετι δε ουρανου φυσιν, και ἡλιου και σεληνης περιοδους, και των αλλων ασ̔ερων τροπας τε και χορειας εναρμονιους, ὡς ποιμην ὁ Θεος αγει κατα δικην και νομον, προστησαμενος τον ορθον ἀυτου λογον, πρωτογονον ὑιον, ὁς την επιμελειαν της ἱερας ταυτης αγελης, ὁια τις μεγαλου βασιλεως ὑπαρχος διαδεξεται. Και γαρ ειρηται που· Ἰδου εγω ειμι, απος̔ελω αγγελον μου, κ. τ. λ. De Agricult. vol. iii. p. 25 & 26. nov. ed.—Mang. vol. i. p. 328.

† "Credibile est, Deum hac promissione se accommodasse ingenio Israelitarum, quorum admodum tenuis erat opinio "de natura, omnipresentia ac providentia divina. Vix enim sibi persuadere potuissent, Deum ipsis semper affore, nisi "promisisset, se per *angelum* eos perducturum esse in terram promissam." Rosenmüller in loc. ‡ Sep. τας σφηκιας—Vulg. *crabrones*—Onk. ערעיתא—Syr. דבוריתא—Arab. Erp. אלנחלה—Gr. Ven. τον σφηκα.

where

where read, in the ſequel of the hiſtory, that hornets, or waſps, or any other ſimilar inſects, were ſent among the Chanaanites: hence ſome interpreters have inferred, that it is a mere metaphorical expreſſion. So Roſenmüller: "Sub crabronibus, *varii generis mala* intelligenda "eſſe videntur, quæ aptiſſimè per hæc inſecta indicari potuerunt, quum eorum punctus do-"lorem efficiat, et magna eorum multitudo homines valde vexare poſſit."—Bochart, on the other hand, contends that the words are to be taken in their proper literal meaning; and has accumulated examples of ſeveral other peoples having been chaſed from their habitations by inſects of different kinds *; and his opinion has been adopted by the bulk of latter commentators. It is no valid objection, ſay they, that it is not ſaid afterwards that *hornets* were *really ſent:* many things *may* have happened which are not recorded. True: but ſtill it is highly improbable that, if this had really happened, and that if an army of hornets had preceded the Iſraelitic armies, in their attacks upon the Chanaanites, it would not have been carefully noticed by the hiſtorian, as an accompliſhment of God's promiſe. But this is not the only objection that I have to *hornets*, either in a real or figurative meaning. How צרעה can have ſuch a ſignification, I cannot well conceive, as neither in Hebrew, nor in any kindred dialect, is there any apparent analogy between it and the root צרע. It was this, no doubt, which made Aben-Ezrah conſider צרעה as ſome malady, which, like leproſy, affected and debilitated the human body: and, from him, Delgado corrects our public verſion thus: "I will "ſend the *fretting leproſy*, &c."—The Arabic tranſlator Saadias underſtood the term in the ſame manner; and, perhaps, the נחלה of Arab. Erp. would be better rendered *tabes* than *apis*.

I will now riſk a new verſion, drawn, I think, from the primitive ſignification of צרע †, which I take to be *proſtration, conſternation, dejection of mind*; and it is not improbable that צרע *a leper*, and צרעת *leproſy*, may have been ſo denominated from the dejection and debility which accompany that loathſome diſeaſe.—This meaning of צרעה is perfectly ſuitable to the context, "I will ſend *conſternation* before you, &c.:" but then we muſt read, not וגרשה, but either וגרשת or וגרשתי. The former of theſe readings is authoriſed by ſome copies of Sep. ‡ and by the Arabic of Saadias §; the latter by other copies of Sep. and by Syr. ‖ I am inclined to think that either of theſe readings is preferable to that of the preſent text: yet there is no variety of lection in the Heb. or Sam. copies.

* Hieroz. pars i. lib. iv. c. 13. † See Caſtell, or Golius, on the Arabic צרע. ‡ So the Rom. edition: εκβαλεις: but Ald. Compl. Alex. and the Coptic verſion, have εκβαλω. The Glaſg. and Canon. MSS. have εκβαλει; and ſo Auſtin ſeems to have read in the Old Italic. Bos (I know not on what authority) ſays, that the Vat. Cod. has εκβαλει. The Roman editors only ſay, *In aliis eſt* εκβαλει. Such copies, I apprehend, had been corrected on the Hebrew; among which are Glaſg. and Canon. MSS. Theodoret, vol. i. p. 327, nov. ed. has εξολοθρευσει, which favours the Heb. text. § תשרד. ‖ אחרוך.

CHAP. XXIV.

Ver. 10. THE meaning of this verſe is, certainly, not obvious. The ſeventy elders, who accompanied Moſes to the mountain, are ſaid to have *ſeen* the God of Iſrael*; of whom, however, it is elſewhere aſſerted, that *no one can ſee him and live.* The author of *Commentaries and Eſſays* is inclined to ſuſpect an error in the Text; and propoſes, inſtead of את, to read אות, and then the verſion will be: "They ſaw the *ſign* of the God, &c." To me this correction appears not neceſſary. To *ſee God*, in the Oriental phraſeology, is to ſee any phenomenon which indicates his *preſence*, *providence*, or *protection.* Hence, here, the Septuagint properly paraphraſe: *και ειδον τον τοπον, ου ειςηκει ὁ Θεος του Ισραηλ—they ſaw the place where ſtood the God of Iſrael.*—The meaning of the whole paſſage, when ſtript of its poetical imagery, I take to be this. A ſelect number of perſons are called up by Moſes, to ſee with their own eyes a ſenſible mark of the divine preſence. For this purpoſe they are permitted to aſcend the mountain, high enough to be above the clouds which ſurrounded its ſides, and to diſcover a purer and brighter ſky than could be ſeen from the plain below, and of which none but thoſe who have been on a mountain above the clouds can have any adequate idea†. This fine, clear, *ſapphire*, ſky is ſuppoſed to be the pavement of God's own heavenly hall, and *ſeeing this* is called *ſeeing God.*—In like manner, the ſtreet of the New Jeruſalem is ſaid, by the poetical author of the Apocalypſe, 21. 2. to be *like tranſparent glaſs.*—Mount Sinai, like Mount Parnaſſus, has two ſummits; the lower one called *Horeb*, and the higher called *Sinai.* The elders of Iſrael were, probably, permitted to aſcend to the top of the former; but the top of the latter was a ſanctuary, acceſſible to Moſes only, and to his ſecretary Joſhuah.—What I have rendered, *equal in brightneſs to the heavens themſelves*, is in the original כעצם השמים לטהר, *like the body* (or *eſſence*) *of the heavens in purity.* The word עצם ſeems to expreſs well the uncommonly fine appearance of the ſky, which the elders muſt have ſeen from the top of Mount Horeb. It was not that face of the heavens which is ſeen through a denſe atmoſphere, but the very naked *body* of the heavens, in its pure native ſplendor.—The metaphor is bold, but beautiful.

Ver. 11. To this verſe thoſe who pointed and divided the Text have added words, which, in my apprehenſion, cannot belong to it; namely, ויאכלו וישתו, *and they ate and drank.* The hiſtorian had juſt before ſaid, that *although they had ſeen God, he had not laid his hand upon them*; i. e. he had not killed them‡: and then follows, *and they ate and drank*; the meaning of

* It is ſomewhat remarkable that the Sam. verſion, inſtead of *they ſaw the God of Iſrael*, has *they revered* (ויעלו) the God of Iſrael; and one of Kennicott's MSS. has that reading, ויראו.

† The ſight, indeed, is wonderful, as my own eyes have witneſſed. The heavens ſeem to put on quite a new appearance; and if the thunder happen, at that time, to roll below, it is highly grand and majeſtic.

‡ The manner in which this comma is paraphraſed by Sep. muſt, at firſt, ſeem ſtrange: *Και των επιλεκτων του Ισραηλ ου διεφωνησεν ουδε εις*: rendered in the Old Ital. and in the Polyglott, *Et de electis Iſrael non diſſonuit nec unus.* But in the language of Sep. διαφωνεω means not *diſſono*, but *pereo*, *poſtremam vocem emittere*; ſo that the proper verſion would be, *Et electorum Iſraelis ne quidem unus periit*; ſeu *mortuus eſt*: "Of the ſelect Iſraelites not one periſhed:" which is equivalent to the Hebrew phraſe, "He laid no hand on them." See Suidas, or Biel.

which

which is, ſay interpreters, that they were ſo far from dying, on account of their having ſeen God, that they ate and drank heartily at the general ſacrifice *. In ſo frigid a conceit I cannot acquieſce, but think that the words ויאכלו וישתו ſhould be disjoined from ver. 11, and added to ver. 12; if it would not be ſtill better to conclude ver. 11 with ידו, and render the next verſe thus: "When they had ſeen God, and had eaten and drunken, then the Lord ſaid to "Moſes, &c.:" and I am not quite ſure that this is not the moſt proper diviſion †.

The natural order and meaning of the Text I take to be this: whilſt the elders were ſeeing God on the mountain, a religious repaſt was preparing below; and when they and Moſes came down, they all ate and drank together, as was uſual at national ſacrifices. When the feaſting was over, the Lord again called Moſes to receive new inſtructions.

The Samaritan Exemplar has, in ver. 11, a reading different from that of the Hebrew; יאחזו for יחזו: and ſo the Sam. verſion, אחדאו; rendered in the Polyglott *adhæſerunt*. But אחז means not to *adhere to*, but to *lay hold on*; and is never ſo conſtructed as here. Two Sam. MSS. have the Heb. reading, יחזו. What induced the Septuagint to render this word by ωφθησαν, it is hard to ſay.

Ver. 14. *If any one have a matter of litigation.* The Hebraiſm here is curious; מי בעל דברים; barbarouſly, but literally, rendered by Montanus ‡, "Quis dominus verborum; and by Gr. Ven. τις κυριος λογων. How much better Sep. εαν τινι συμβῃ κρισις; and Vulg. *ſi quid natum fuerit quæſtionis:* and ſo equivalently all the other ant. verſions.—I find in Bp. Law's MST. notes a very ſingular interpretation of the above words: "Whoſoever would be a man of "words, i. e. learn the letters which were taught by Moſes, &c." Unde hæc?

CHAP. XXV.

Ver. 4. *COTTON.* שש. Which our tranſlators render *fine linen*—Sep. βυσσον—Jerom. *byſſum*—Onk. and Tharg. בון—Syr. בוצא—Saad. עשר—Erp. כתאנא—Perſ. כתאן—Gr. Ven. λινον.—That שש, or שיש, means not *linen*, but *cotton*, is pretty certain; but why is it called שש? According to Michaëlis, becauſe it was *ſix-fold:* but I doubt much if ever yarn or thread of any kind conſiſted of ſo many plies. That it was twiſted, is plain from the epithet משזר, commonly annexed to it, and which the Septuagint read here βυσσον κεκλωσμενην; but that it had ſix plaits is not at all probable. I rather think that it had its name from its colour. It is the ſame word which is uſed in Eſther to denote marble, and שישא in Syr. is *white marble.*—There is a verb in the Hebrew which ſeems to favour this conjecture; שוש, *gaviſus eſt.* It is remarkable that *albus*, in Latin, and λευκος, in Greek, denote *joy* and *jocundity*— λευκην ἡμεραν αγειν—*albos dies tranſigere.*

Ver. 5. *Seals' ſkins.* The meaning of תחש is not eaſily aſcertained. The antients vary in

* "Tantum abfuit, ut mortui eſſent; ut, contra, convivium ſacrificale hilares celebrarent." Roſenmüller in loc.

† Which is followed in the Frankfort edition of Sep. and in that of Venice, 1687; and indeed all the other editions, ſave Grabe's, have a full-point after ουδε εἰς. ‡ Which he ſubſtituted for Pagninus's verſion, *quiſquis habuerit cauſas:* much better than our Engliſh verſion—"If any man have any matters to do." I wonder ſuch ſcrupulous tranſlators did not put the Hebraiſm in the margin.

rendering

rendering it. Sep. took it for a colour; δερματα ὑακινθινα—Aq. Sym. and Theod. ιανθινα; and ſo Vulg. *ianthina*—Onk. Tharg. and Syr. ססגונא; by Buxtorf rendered *taxus*, but by the Latin tranſlator of Syr. and by Walton, *cærulei*, or *ſubnigri coloris*. To the ſame purport both Arabs. גלוד דארס, *pelles ſubnigræ* *. From all theſe authorities, and that of Joſephus, Bochart contends that the comma ought to be rendered *rams' ſkins of a red and of a violet colour*. "An outer-covering, for the tabernacle, of azure-blue," ſays Parkhurſt, "was very "proper to repreſent the ſky, or azure boundary of the ſyſtem." All this is ſpecious; yet I hardly think that the writer, if he had meant to expreſs only a variety of colour in the *rams' ſkins*, would have repeated ערות after מאדמים. It is more natural then to look for another ſpecies of animal in the word תחש; but what animal, it is not ſo eaſy to determine. The Perſic tranſlator took it to be a *buck-goat*, אסתוּ; and the Gr. of Venice *a panther*, δερματα παρδαλεως.

The Jewiſh interpreters are agreed as to its being ſome animal. Jarhi ſays it was a beaſt of many colours, which no more exiſts. Kimhi holds the ſame opinion, and thinks that it is called ססגונא in the Thargums, quaſi ששגונא, from its having *ſix* colours. Aben-Ezrah, with more judgment, thinks it was ſome animal of the *bovine* kind, *thick* and *fat*; "for, of the "ſkins of ſuch animals," ſays he, "*ſhoes* are made†. His words are: עורות תחשים עור בהמה שהוא עב' כי הנעל לא יעשה כי אם מעור עב כעור השור' ולפי דעתי שהוא שור. This is certainly a moſt ſenſible remark; and if we knew well what the rareſt ſhoes were made of, in the time of Ezekiel, we ſhould be at little loſs to aſcertain the meaning of תחש‡. Moſt modern interpreters have taken it to be the *badger*, and among theſe our laſt Engliſh tranſlators §; but, in the firſt place, the *badger* is not an inhabitant of Arabia; and there is nothing in its ſkin peculiarly proper either for covering a tabernacle or making ſhoes.—Others, moved by a certain ſimilarity of ſound, will have it to be the θως of the Greeks; or the Arabic *ſhagaal* (vulgo *jackal*).

Haſæus, Michaëlis, and others, have laboured to prove that תחש is the *mermaid*, or *homo marinus*; the *trichekus* of Linnæus: but the ſkin of this fiſh is not at all proper either for ſhoes or the covering of a tent, on account of its hardneſs and unpliability. I cannot, therefore, but adopt, with Faber, Dathe, and Roſenmüller, the opinion of Rau; that תחש is the *ſeal*, or *ſea-calf*; *vitulus marinus*; the ſkin of which is both ſtrong and pliable, and was accounted by the antients as a moſt proper outer-covering for tents, being ſuppoſed to be thunder-proof ‖; and was alſo made into ſhoes, as Rau has clearly ſhewn ¶. The word תחש, then, appears to be the ſame with the Arabic דחֹם, written alſo דחֹש, *craſſus*, *pinguis*, *carnoſus*; an epithet ſo peculiarly applicable to the animal in queſtion, that it is in the north of this iſland a vulgar proverb—"He is as fat ** as a ſeal."

Ib. *Setim-wood*. עצי שטים††. I have, with Jerom and Onkelos, retained the Hebrew word,

* So it is rendered in the Polyglott, and by Caſtell; but I ſhould rather think that it meant *tanned*, *curried*, or ſome ſuch term. † He alludes to Ezek. 16. 10. ‡ What has been ſaid on the ſubject may be read in Bynæus, *De Calceis Hebræorum*, firſt printed at Dort, in 1682, and reprinted in Ugolini's Collection, vol. xxix. p. 672. § So Purver: but Bate, *ermine-ſkins*; Coverdale, *doe-ſkins*. ‖ See Pliny, lib. ii. c. 55. ¶ *Comment. de iis quæ ex Arabia in uſum tabernaculi fuerunt petita*, c. 2. See C. R. on Ezek. 16. 10. ** In Erſe, *ſeal*, or *ſeál*, ſignifies the *fat* of animals. †† In Iſaiah, 41. 19. it is written שטה.

word, although there is little doubt of its being a ſpecies of white-thorn, or the *ſpina Ægyptiaca*, which grows abundantly about Mount Sinai, but "is the tree of all countries from the "northmoſt parts of Arabia to the extremity of Ethiopia." Bruce, vol. i. p. 93. It is by Sep. rendered ασηπτα, *incorruptible*; expreſſing its ſuppoſed quality rather than its name. The Syr. tranſlator took it for *ebony*, the Perſic for *box-wood*, and Gr. Ven. for the *cypreſs*; but both Arabs have rightly אלסנט *, the *ſont*-wood, which is the very Egyptian name for the foreſaid *acacia*, or *white-thorn* †.

Among the Jewiſh commentators the common opinion is that it was the *cedar*: but there are no cedars about Mount-Sinai! No matter for that. R. Tanchuma tells us, that Father Jacob, foreſeeing that his offspring would have to erect a tabernacle in the wilderneſs, brought cedar-plants with him into Egypt, which grew there to be trees, and which he ordered to be felled, and carried away, when the Iſraelites ſhould leave that country.—Aben-Ezrah, with his uſual good ſenſe, only ſays that it was a wood which grew about Mount-Sinai: and Hiſkuni deſcribes it nearly in the ſame manner as Jerom: "Eſt genus arboris naſcentis in eremo, "ſpinæ albæ habens ſimilitudinem; unde omnia ligna arcæ et tabernaculi facta ſunt inſtru-"menta, quæ appellantur SETTIM: quod lignum *imputribile*, et leviſſimum, omnium ligno-"rum, tam in fortitudine quam in nitore ſoliditatem ſuperat et pulchritudinem." Comment. in Iſ. tom. iii. p. 314. ed. Bened.—From the ſame Jerom we learn, that it was by Theodotion rendered *ſpina*; unnoticed by Montfaucon and Bahrdt. The verſions of Aquila and Symmachus are loſt.

Ver. 6. Is wanting in Sep. Vat.; but the editors obſerve that it is *in aliis ferme omnibus libris*. It is inſerted in the London Polyglott within brackets, but in Bos without any diſtinction. It will, I doubt not, be found in moſt of Holmes's MSS.

Ver. 8. *Let a ſanctuary be made to me, that I may dwell among you.* Moſes knew too well the nature of his nation not to give them *a tabernacle made with hands*, as the reſidence of their peculiar God. They had been long accuſtomed to ſee ſuch ſanctuaries in Egypt ‡, and had worſhipped the divinities which were ſuppoſed to reſide in them; for it is certain, that during the ſojournment of the Iſraelites in Egypt they followed the rites and religion of that country, and were (many of them, at leaſt) groſs idolaters §. To wean them gradually from that idolatrous and polytheiſtic worſhip, Moſes wiſely indulged them with an external reſemblance of it. He gave them a portable temple, an ark, an altar, ſacrifices, purifications, feſtivals, muſic, dances; which played upon their imaginations and affected their ſenſes, too groſs and ſtupid to ſavour a pure, ſimple, genuine, religion, by which God is adored *in ſpirit and in truth*. Indeed the bulk of mankind, *qui ſtupet in titulis et imaginibus*, ſeem to have a natural propenſity to be pleaſed with outward ſhew and tinſel ſplendor, even in matters of religion: and it is well known how ſoon Chriſtianity itſelf began to judaize, nay paganize, in that reſpect.

With regard to the Hebrew worſhip, I have here advanced nothing but what has been al-

* It is alſo written סישאן, which comes nearer to the Chald. סישין, and the Heb. שׁשׁים. † See Theod. Haſæus *De Ligno Settim*, apud Ugolini, vol. viii. p. 352. ‡ We learn from Herodotus (Euterp. c. 4.), that the Egyptians were the firſt who raiſed temples to their gods. § See Joſh. 24. 14. and Ezek. 23. 3, 8, 19.

lowed

lowed by the moſt learned of the Chriſtian Fathers, whoſe teſtimonies the reader may ſee in Spencer *. I ſhall content myſelf with a ſingle quotation from Theodoret. After a long invective againſt the heathen ſacrifices and ſuperſtitions, he makes to himſelf this objection—"But perhaps they will dare to retort all this on the true and eternal God, becauſe they hear "of laws relative to ſacrifices in the divine Scripture!"—To which he anſwers, that thoſe objectors "are ignorant of the deſign and ſcope of the legiſlator; who, knowing that the "Iſraelites, from their long reſidence in Egypt, had caught the depraved manners of that "nation, and been taught to ſacrifice to idols and dæmons, and to delight in play, dancing, "and muſic; leſt they ſhould be indignant at being altogether precluded from thoſe habits, he, "like a wiſe phyſician, provided for their Egyptian malady this remedy: he indulged them "with ſacrifices, on account of their weakneſs; but ordered them to immolate what they "had formerly adored, beeves, ſheep, goats, &c.: for if, as ſoon as they were delivered from "the power of the Egyptians, he had given them perfect laws, they would have reſiſted, and, "refuſing the yoke, have returned to their former depravity: for if, even with all this eco-"nomy, they often attempted to do ſo, what would they not have dared to do, if God, "from the beginning, had enjoined the philoſophy of the Goſpel †?"

Ver. 10. *An ark*, or rather *coffer*, *cheſt*. ארון. Sep. κιβωτον ‡. That the Egyptians, Phenicians, and almoſt all the antient nations, had their ſacred *arks*, or *cheſts*, as well as the Hebrews, is ſo clearly ſhewn by Spencer §, that no one who has read him can entertain a doubt of it. To him, therefore, I beg leave to refer my readers, on this ſubject, and on all the apparatus of the tabernacle, which I have no doubt of having been borrowed from the Egyptians; perhaps with ſome variation as to their forms and particular uſes. The eſſential difference conſiſted in this, that Moſes applied them all to the worſhip of one inviſible God, Jehovah; whom he makes the ſpecial God of the Iſraelites.—See the concluding article of this Volume.

Ver. 18. *Cherubs*; commonly written *Cherubim*, the Hebrew plural of the word. They were creatures of mere fancy, compoſed of *man*, *lion*, *ox*, and *eagle* ‖. Almoſt every nation has had its *cherubs*, *ſphinxes*, *griffons*, or *dragons*, to guard its ſanctuary and ſacred things, and to frighten the vulgar from approaching.

* *De Legibus Hebræorum*, lib. iii. c. 1. † Ταυτα δε τυχον και αυτοι περι του οντος Θεου, και αει γε οντος φαναι τολμησουσιν· επειδη των μεν περι Θυσιων εν τη θειᾳ γραφη κειμενων επαϊουσι νομων, τον δε του νομοθετου παντελως αγνοουσι σκοπον· εν γαρ δη τη Αιγυπτῳ πλειστον ὁσον τον Ισραηλ διατριψαντα χρονον, και τα πονηρα των εγχωριων εισδεξαμενον εθη, και θυειν ειδωλοις και δαιμοσι παρ' εκεινων μεμαθηκοτα, και παιζειν, και χορευειν, και οργανοις μουσικοις επιτερπεσθαι .... Ἱνα τοινυν μη δυσχεραινωσιν, ὡς των εθων εκεινων παμπαν κεκωλυμενοι .... τοδε το φαρμακον ὁ πανσοφος ιατρος τη Αιγυπτιᾳ προσενηνοχε νοσῳ· θυειν μεν, δια την των θυοντων ασθενειαν ξυγχωρησας, τα δε σεβομενα παρ' αυτων ἱερευειν κελευσας .... Ει γαρ ευθυς της Αιγυπτιων εξουσιας απαλλαγεισι τους τελειους προσενηνοχε νομους, παντως αν απεσκιρτησαν, και τον χαλινον απωσαμενοι προς τον προτερον επαλινδρομησαν ολεθρον. Ει γαρ και τουτων ὁυτω πρυτανευθεντων, επειραθησαν τουτο δρασαι πολλακις, τι ουκ αν ετολμησαν, ει την ευαγγελικην αυτοις ευθυς εξ αρχης φιλοσοφιαν ενομοθετησεν. Theodoret. Græc. Affect. Curatio. diſput. vii. tom. iv. p. 887 and 888. nov. ed.

‡ Aq. Sym. Theod. γλωσσοκομον. Vulg. *arcam*. Onk. and Tharg. ארונא. Syr. קאבותא, from the Greek. Both Arabs: צנדקא, *loculus*. Perſ. צנדוק. Gr. Ven. χηλον. § Lib. iii. diſſert. 5. p. 380, &c. ‖ The idea was moſt probably borrowed from the Egyptian ſphinx. Comp. Ezek. i. 6—10: and ſee Spencer, lib. iii. diſſert. iii. c. 3. and Herder *Vom geiſt der Helräiſchen Poeſie*, part i. p. 177. who overturns the ſyſtem of Michaëlis by unanſwerable arguments.

Ver. 22.

Ver. 22. *There will I manifeſt myſelf to thee.* I have followed Sep. who render נועדתי by γνωσθησομαι. The reſt vary: Aq. Sym. Th. συνταξομαι; from whom Vulg. *præcipiam*; but Syr. has אתועד לך, *I will meet with thee*; and ſo equivalently both Arabs, Perſ. and Gr. Ven.: and this rendering was followed by our laſt Engliſh tranſlators, "There will I meet with thee*." The queſtion is, whether the root of the word here uſed be ידע or יעד. The Sep. certainly read in their copies נודעתי from יזע. But beſides their authority, which is great, I obſerve, with Houbigant, that the verb יעד is not conſtructed with a dative, except in this and the parallel places ch. 29. 42—30. 36. and Num. 17. 4. in all which places the Septuagint have, as here, γνωσθησομαι.—Michaëlis, Dathe, and Roſenmüller, prefer the other reading, which has on its ſide the authority of Sam.

Ver. 29. The names of the veſſels belonging to the bread-table have been given with ſome degree of probability, but not with certainty. I ſhall here give the Hebrew terms, with their correſponding ant. verſions.

1. *Platters.* קערתי. Sep. τρυβλια—Vulg. *acetabula*—Onk. מניסיא, *lances*; the ſame with the Greek μαγιδες—Tharg. פיילת; and Syr. פילסא; which ſeems to denote a flat plate like the ſcale of a balance—Sam. Verſ. צעי, *ſcutellas*—Saad. קצאע, from the idea of *rotundity*—Arab. Erp. עצאצר, *paropſides*—Perſ. כסהאיי, *phialas*—Gr. Ven. τρυβλια, coinciding with Sep.—Our public verſion, *diſhes*.—It was moſt probably a broad *platter*, or *charger*, of a large ſize, as we learn from Num. 7. 13. &c. where the ſilver *platters* preſented by the chiefs of tribes weighed 130 ſhekels.

2. *Incenſe-pots.* כפתי. Sep. θυϊσκας—Vulg. *phialas*; and ſo Sam. ver. פילואת—Onk. and Tharg. בזיכיא, *arculas*—Syr. כפא, from the idea of *hollowneſs*—Saad. דרוג, *capſulas*—Arab. Erp. מעארף, *cochlearia*—Perſ. דמחאיי, of the ſame import—Gr. Ven. δοιδυκας—Our public verſion, *ſpoons*.

3. *Cups.* קשותי. Sep. σπονδεια—Vulg. *thuribula*—Onk. and Tharg. retain the Heb. word—Syr. זבורא—Both Arabs, מדאהן—Perſ. נידאיי, *calamos*—Gr. Ven. καλαμους—Our public verſion, *covers* †.—I have no doubt of its being a *cup* or *chalice*; but of what ſize or form, it is hard to ſay. The firſt cups were probably nut-ſhells, called קשותי from their *hardneſs*. See Lex. Syr. under the word קשיתא. See alſo the Arab. קשא; which, with other ſignifications, has that of *cortex, integumentum*.

4. *Cans.* מנקיותי. Sep. κυαθους—Vulg. *cyathos*—Onk. and Tharg. מכילתי, *menſuras, modios*—Syr. מניקיתא, almoſt the Heb. word—Both Arabs, מלאעק ‡, *cochlearia*—Perſ. סיחדאיי, tranſlated in Pol. *obelos*; but *pocula libatoria* by Walton; who adds: "Chald. בסא, et per "metathefin Syr. מסא, quâ ipsâ voce utitur Bar-Bahlul in exponendo Syr. כניקיתא. Favet

* But Cov. Cran. Biſh. *teſtify unto thee.* Genev. *declare myſelf unto thee*; with a marginal reading, *will appoint with thee*; which correſponds with the verſion of Onk. and Tharg. † The Jewiſh commentators, in general, explain it to be golden *rods*, which were placed upright on each ſide of the table, with holes in them to receive other tranſverſe rods or *ſtaves*; which, paſſing between the two rows of loaves, by the admiſſion of air prevented them from growing mouldy. Theſe ſtaves were called מנקיות, or *clean-keepers*, from נקי. But all this appears to be rabbinical conceit; and I would, in this caſe, truſt more to the Greek tranſlators of the Pentateuch than to all the rabbis together. Beſides, the moſt antient Jewiſh interpreters, Onk. and Tharg. are evidently againſt this interpretation.
‡ In Arab. Erp. the diacritic mark has been miſtaken; or, perhaps, מלאעק may have the ſame ſignification with מלאעק.

" etiam ſeq. בושידא." I am rather inclined to think that the Polyglott verſion is right, and that the Perſic tranſlator, with the Jewiſh Rabbis, had in view the *ſtaves* or *ſpits* above-mentioned. The Gr. of Venice certainly ſo underſtood it, as he has παταλους, for παπταλους, and that for παασσαλους: but theſe are the only two ant. verſions that favour the rabbinical interpretation. I take מנקה, with Onk. to be the veſſel out of which the wine was poured, and the preceding קשות the cup into which it was poured. This latter I render *cup*, the former *can*; but whether they are the moſt proper words that can be uſed, I will not pretend to ſay *. In Num. 4. 7. the order of theſe two laſt utenſils is inverted, *cans and cups*, which ſhews that they were both uſed

lb. *For making libations.* אשר יסך בהן. Sep. εν οις σπεισεις εν αυτοις—Vulg. *in quibus offerenda ſunt libamina*; and ſo equivalently Onk. Tharg. and Syr. But both Arabs. with Perſ. and Gr. Ven. have words that denote *covering*. The laſt, as being the moſt literal, I ſhall here give: οις καλυφθησεται εν αυτοις. Our public verſion has, likewiſe, " to cover withal †;" and Delgado, " wherewith it ſhall be covered;" which is the very Genevan-Engliſh verſion. Thoſe who ſo render take יסך for a part of the verb סכך, *to cover*; but what *covering* has to do here, it is not eaſy to conceive; whereas every preceding word bids us look for *libation*. יסך then is to be conſidered as a part of the verb נסך, as the Septuagint, Vulg. Syr. and the more antient Thargumiſts, very properly underſtood it ‡.

Ver. 31. *Of ſolid work ſhalt thou make it.* The word מקשה is variouſly rendered by the antients.—Sep. τορευτην—Vulg. *ductile*; and ſo equivalently Onk. and Tharg.—Syr. נסכתא, *molten*. But Saadias has a word which ſeems well to expreſs the meaning; namely, מצתמתה; rendered in Pol. *fuſile*; but its true meaning is *ſolid, not hollow*, nor compoſed of parts. It was fuſed in one ſolid maſs; well expreſſed by Gr. Ven. συνεχη. That this is the meaning, is pretty clear from what follows, that all the parts of the chandelier were to be of one piece §; ממנה יהיו. Houbigant, however, underſtands it otherwiſe, and thus renders the verſe: *Facies etiam candelabrum auro mundo; ductili opere facies candelabri et ſcapum et brachia; ex eoque eminebunt calices, ſpherulæ ac flores.* His reaſon is, that the affix in ממנה, being feminine, cannot agree with זהב. But there is no neceſſity for this agreement; the antecedent is not זהב, but מנורה; and his conſtruction of the text is harſh and uncouth.

Ver. 33. *Almond-ſhaped cups.* גבעים משקדים; which Sep. render more generically: κρατηρες εκτετυπωμενοι καρυισκους, *cups reſembling nuts*. So Vulg. *inſtar nucis*. Sym. uſes a ſtill leſs explicit term, εντετομευμενοι; but Aquila, moſt literally, εξημυγδαλισμενοι; and Gr. Ven. αμυγδαλωται.—Some moderns have imagined that by גביע is here meant the *calix* (properly ſo called in the language of botany), that כפתר is the *pericarp*, and פרח the *corolla*. See Michaëlis, *Supplem. ad Lex. Heb.* or Roſenmüller *in loc.*

* The verſion of Houbigant is, *ſcutellas—lances—pateras—phialas*; of Dathe, *ſcutellas—lances—pateras—cyathos*; of Michaëlis, *Flache—tiefe taſſen—ſchalen—kannen*; and of Roſenmüller, *lances—acerras—phialas—cyathos*.

† Our more ant. verſions: " to pour out with all." Coverdale: " to pour out and in." ‡ So our moſt learned modern tranſlators. Houb. *quibus litabitur*; Dathe, *quibus libetur*; Michaëlis, *den wein aus und ein zu ſchenken*. One would think he had Coverdale's verſion before him. § The comma is well rendered by the Perſic tranſlator: *Let the chandelier be of one maſs.*

CHAP.

CHAP. XXVI.

TO what has been ſaid in Expl. Notes I have here to add ſome remarks on the dimenſions of the tabernacle; which, as they are not mentioned, we muſt gueſs at from the dimenſions of the curtains and the boards. If the latter lay cloſe one to another, the thing is eaſy, with reſpect to the length at leaſt. Twenty boards, of 1½ cubit each, give 30 cubits.—The breadth is not ſo eaſily aſcertained: Joſephus makes it 12 feet, taking it for granted, no doubt, that the 8 boards, including the two corner ones, ſtood exactly in the ſame direction. But then this will not anſwer with the dimenſions of the curtains. The fine cotton curtains, when joined together, conſiſted of a piece of 40 cubits by 28. Hence Houbigant determined the length of the tabernacle to be 40 cubits; for a piece 40 cubits long and 28 broad was juſt ſufficient, ſays he, to cover its top and two ſides. but he conſidered not that, by this economy, the back part is left entirely uncovered: nor can he provide for this omiſſion even in the ſecond covering of goats-hair. We muſt therefore neceſſarily reſtrict the length to 30 cubits; and even then the firſt ſet of curtains will want a cubit on each ſide to cover the tabernacle cloſe to the ground; which want was probably intended, leſt ſo fine a piece of embroidered work ſhould be ſullied. It might indeed have touched the ground on the back end, behind the ſanctuary, unleſs a part of it were pendulous over the fore end. However this be, it could not, certainly, cover both ſides and the back end of the tabernacle, if the tabernacle had been longer than 30 cubits. This is alſo confirmed by the dimenſions of the ſecond ſet of curtains, which were altogether 44 cubits by 30; ſo that they exceeded the inner curtains in length four, in breadth two, cubits. Of the former ſurplus, two, or perhaps the whole four, cubits were either doubled back or doubled down; i. e. they hang over the fore end of the tabernacle: and of the latter, a cubit on each ſide covered the ſpace left open by the inner curtains towards the ground, to which the ſecond curtains were probably pinned down, behind the ſilver baſes. At the back end there was, beſides, an overplus of two cubits, if the curtain-piece next to the fore end were doubled down in the middle; but if it were doubled down at the ſeam, there was no ſurplus of curtain behind the tabernacle. This, I think, is the only intelligible ſcheme which ſuits the hiſtorian's deſcription; and is not liable, as far as I can ſee, to any capital objection.

"But," ſays Houbigant, "if the tabernacle were only 30 cubits long, the boards muſt "have ſtood cloſe together: but it is not likely that this was intended; for, in that caſe, "the fine embroidery of the interior curtains would not have been ſeen at all, neither within "the tabernacle nor without it."—Whatever become of the viſibility of the embroidery, we muſt not admit abſurdities. If the embroidered curtain were intended to be ſeen within the tabernacle, it would have been better to hang it on the boards within *, or to have only a few

* It is even a doubt with me whether this was not the caſe; at leaſt there is nothing in the text that ſeems to prove the contrary. Nay, from the curtains of goats-hair being called an *overtent*, we are at liberty to ſuppoſe the boards to have been placed between them and the cotton curtains which ſerved as a tapeſtry to the wall of gilt wood without them.

round pillars to ſupport it at conſiderable intervals; for, even in Houbigant's diſtribution of the boards, there muſt have been three-fourths of the embroidery concealed if the curtains were hung without them, as the intervals were only of half a cubit. What is ſtill worſe, the boards at the back end, excluſive of the two corner ones, muſt have given 12 cubits for the breadth, and 15 cubits, if the two corner ones ſtood in the ſame direction. In truth, theſe two corner-boards are troubleſome, even when the other ſix are placed cloſe together, as Houbigant is here obliged to do in order to keep to his 10 cubits of breadth; and therefore he ſuppoſes that a whole cubit of each of the two corner-boards was taken up in mortiſing, or projected beyond the ſide-board, with which it was connected. But we read of neither mortiſes nor projections; and we learn that the two corner-boards were joined to the boards next them, on both ſides, with ſtaples, both above and below; ſo that we may ſuppoſe them to have ſtood not at right angles with the ſide-boards, but at an obtuſe angle of about 130 degrees, which would make the breadth of the tabernacle juſt 10 cubits. The very Heb. word מקצעות, ver. 23, ſeems to denote an angle of this ſort. It comes from a root which ſignifies *abradere*; in Chald. *amputare*; in Arab. and Ethiopic, *comprimere, curvare, deprimere.* So we might call a *bevel* a *depreſſed angle.* Such, at leaſt, is the moſt ſatisfactory idea that I can form of it.

Ver. 17. *Tenons.* Heb. ידות. Which lit. ſignifies *hands.* But the word takes a variety of metaphorical acceptations; *handle, hinge, ſtem, ſtalk, fruit-pedicle,* &c. It is here rendered by Sep. αγκωνισκους; of which the true meaning is uncertain. The old Ital. retains the Gr. word *anconiſcos.* It is here ſuppoſed to denote *hinges*; "which like two hands hold one "another," ſays Biel. He ſeems to have had in view our common *joint-hinges*; but that cannot be here the meaning of αγκωνισκους. If we attend to the etymon, αγκων being an *elbow*, αγκωνισκος will be a *little elbow*; and this may metaphorically denote a hinge *properly* ſo called, which, like the male hinges of our great gates, reſts and turns in its ſocket; and in a ſimilar ſenſe it may be taken here, with this difference only, that it did not turn, but was fixed in its ſocket. Certain it is that Onk. Tharg. and Syr. have words that denote *hinges*; and the Gr. Ven. has δυο θειρω. The Vulg. has *incaſtraturæ*, mortiſes. He ſeems to have thought that the boards were mortiſed together. But this idea is unwarrantable; for it is clear from ver. 19 that the ידות were to be placed on the ſilver baſes. The Samaritan verſion has a word which, in my apprehenſion, well expreſſes the meaning of the original, סכין, *paxillus*, παξσαλος: but the κατοχεις, *retinacula*, of Symmachus, is, I believe, the beſt rendering; and correſponds with our *tenons.*—The *tongue-like hinges*, צרין מלשנאן, of Saadias, are reducible to the ſame meaning; and perhaps the *tenons* of the boards of the tabernacle were of a tongue-like tapered ſhape. Michaëlis thinks they were pointed, ſo as to pierce the ground after having gone through the baſes: but it is more probable that the baſes themſelves were fixed to the ground by ſome means or other—perhaps on a frame of wood *. The only thing that here ſeems to beget a real difficulty is the word משלבות, rendered by Sep. αντιπιπτοντας, by Jerom *quibus tabula*

* Houbigant imagined that the ידות were two grapples, or *keep-faſts*, which, projecting from the face of the boards on each ſide, and having their other ends fixed to the ſilver baſes, ſerved to keep the boards perpendicular. For if, ſays he, the ſilver baſes were not thus placed, one in the inſide and one on the outſide, the baſes being forty, and each one-half cubit long, muſt have reached far beyond the length of the tabernacle, which is abſurd.—Abſurd to be ſure: but

bula alteri tabulæ connectatur. The other antient verſions either retain the Heb. word, or lean to the meaning of Vulg.; which, I have already obſerved, is inadmiſſible. The Gr. of Venice ſeems to have underſtood the word properly, as he has rendered it by ἡρμωσμεναις. The tenons were all made in ſymmetry and *harmony*; that is, they were all exactly ſimilar, of the ſame form and dimenſion. Houbigant, to juſtify his *grapples*, derives משלבות from the Arab. צלב, becauſe this word, in Avicenna, ſignifies the *ſpine*, or *back-bone*, conſiſting of *vertebræ:* But this I believe will, to moſt Oriental ſcholars, appear a forced etymon. His derivation of the Latin word *ſyllaba*, from the ſame root, is ſtill more ridiculous. The truth is, that the primary radical meaning of שלב is very uncertain: it occurs only here, and again ch. 36. 22. and 1 K. 7. 28, 29, where its ſignification is as indeterminate as here *.—From the ſiſter dialects we derive not much aid. In Syr. however, שולבא ſignifies a *bird's tail*; and we have a ſort of *tenon* called a *dove-tail.* In the ſuppoſition that this is the primitive radical meaning, may not משלבות denote tenons in the form of a tail, which comes near to the Arab. verſion *tongue-ſhaped?*—At any rate I am convinced that the tenons were all of one form, as well as the ſockets of the baſes; and, indeed, if theſe were caſt in the ſame mould, as is moſt probable, a perfect ſimilarity in the tenons was abſolutely neceſſary, whether they were cut in the wood, or pieces of metal driven into the ends of the boards; which, for aught we know, might be the caſe.

Ver. 19. *Baſes.* אדנים. Sep. βασεις: Vulg. *baſes:* and ſo the other verſions are rendered in the Polyglott: but I believe that the סמכין of Onk. and the סמכא of Syr. ought to be rendered *fulcra*, *bearers* or *underſetters*; a word which our Engliſh tranſlators have employed to render כתפות. The word uſed by both Arabs, קאעדה, bears the ſame meaning.—It is remarkable that the Sam. tranſlator, after uſing the Heb. word אדני in the firſt comma of the verſe, in the ſecond and third comma expreſſes the ſame word by לבנים. Did he think that the *baſes* reſembled a *plinth* or *tile?* Perhaps they really did; perhaps they were ſquare pieces of ſilver fixed on a frame of wood, and pierced in the middle to take in each its tenon, ſo that every board entered into the ſockets of two baſes, and, may be, entered ſome ſpace into the wood below. Joſephus ſeems to have well underſtood the paſſage: "In each of the "boards," ſays he, "were two hinges, which were driven into two baſes which were made of "ſilver, and which had holes to receive the hinges †."

Ver. 24. It is ſufficiently clear from this verſe that the two angular boards were placed in a

but this is all a mere imagination: it is no where ſaid that the baſes were each one 1-half cubit long, that is, equal to the breadth of the boards: it is not even certain if the two baſes together were ſo long as the breadth of one board: that would depend upon the ſize of the tenons, and their ſize on the thickneſs of the boards, which, if we can believe Joſephus, was *four inches*. A plank of this ſize would admit of a ſtrong tenon indeed; at leaſt of four ſquare inches; and ſuch tenons, lodged in proportionate ſockets, would have a ſufficient hold to keep them upright without the aid of grapples; the projection of which would, in the inſide at leaſt, have been both unſeemly and inconvenient. Beſides, the boards were kept together by rows of bars, which, if properly adjuſted, would alone keep the boards perpendicular; and there was at leaſt one croſs beam between the Holy and Moſt Holy Place, which would ſerve to the ſame purpoſe. The tent-ropes, too, would alſo contribute. * In our public verſion it is differently rendered in all thoſe places. In Exod. 26. 17. *ſet in order:* Exod. 36. 22. *equally diſtant*: Kings, *the ledges.* † Δυο δ'αυτων [κιονων] ἑκαστῳ προσησαν στροφιγγες, ελαυνομενοι κατα δυο βασεων (αυται δ'αργυραι μεν ησαν) πυλις δ'ἑκατερα τουτων προσην, δεχομενη τον στροφιγγα. Ant. lib. iii. c. 6. n. 3. p. 132.

manner

manner peculiar to themſelves; but in what preciſe manner, it is hard to ſay. In my Expl. Note I have obſerved, that perhaps the text is in ſome degree corrupted. Mr. Dimock ſuſpects that the word ויחדו may have been tranſpoſed, and that it ſtood originally after האחת; and then, reading ראש ואל inſtead of ראשו אל, he would render thus, "They ſhall be cou-" pled beneath, and they ſhall be coupled above, and ſhall be united by one ring."—"Or," adds he, "if we make יחדו an adverb, it ſhould be ſupplied after ויהיו." Yet all the ant. interpreters ſeem to have had the preſent Hebrew Text before them, although they knew not well what to make of it. Here it is, with our common Engliſh verſion, which is nearly as literal as that of Montanus *: ויהיו תאמים מלמטה ויחדו יהיו תמים על ראשו אל הטבעת האחת כן : יהיה לשניהם לשני המקצעות יהיו : "and they ſhall be coupled together beneath, and they ſhall " be coupled together above the head of it unto one ring: thus ſhall it be for them both, they " ſhall be for the two corners." Is this intelligible?

Of the ant. verſions I will only give that of Sep. becauſe, in general, I conſider its authority as ſuperior to that of the reſt. Και εσχι † εξ ισου κατωθεν· κατα το αυτο εσονται ισοι εκ των κεφαλων ‡ εις συμβλησιν §· μιαν. It is clear, from this rendering, 1ſt. that they read in their copy יחדו ‖ with Sam.; 2dly. that with Sam. alſo they read תאמים twice; and this, I have no doubt, is the genuine original reading ¶. By the help of this reading, then, and of the various readings of the Hebrew copies, I would thus correct the text: והיו תואמין מלמטה׳ ויחדו יהיו תאמים על ראש׳ ואל הטבעת האחת. *Et erunt gemellæ infra, et pariter gemellæ ſupra; et in eâdem commiſſurâ.*—The meaning then ſeems to be, that the two angular boards were connected with the other boards, not at right angles, but in an oblique ſituation; ſuppoſe at an angle of 130 degrees; or perhaps the board itſelf conſiſted of two pieces joined together at that angle by claſps or ſtaples, and hence called *twins*. That the back end corners were bevelled off is highly probable from this, that an acute angle at the top would have been apt to lacerate the covering **.

Ver. 35. In the preſent Heb. copies, and in all the verſions, the ten following verſes in my verſion are found at the beginning of ch. 30. but in the Sam. copies they are inſerted between ver. 35 and ver. 36 of ch. 26, and this is evidently their proper place. See Kennicott's *Remarks*, p. 53. He well obſerves, that "the diſlocated paſſage, conſiſting of 10 verſes, " which contain 126 words, might antiently fill one page, or one ſide of a leaf of vellum; " and this odd leaf, when the parts of an old roll, ſeparated by time or accident, were to be " again ſewed together, might be faſtened on improperly, i. e. after 2, 3, 4, or any other

* *Et erunt geminatæ de infra et pariter erunt perfectæ ſuper caput ejus ad annulum unum. Sic erit ambabus ipſis, in duobus angulis erunt.* † So Rom.; but all the other editions, with Glaſg. and Canon. have εσονται. ‡ Al. κεφαλιδων. § Al. συμβολην. ‖ The Alex. MS. has indeed και κατα; but that exemplar is one of thoſe which have been altered to make them agree with the Heb. copies. ¶ It was the reading of Onk. Saad. and even of the Perſic tranſlator. ** "Si enim aſſeres angulares parte ſuperiore acuti fuiſſent, ſtragulæ eis " impoſitæ corruptæ eſſent"—Roſenmüller, who is of opinion that the angular boards had two ſides: "ita ut hi " aſſeres ſint loco tigni angularis, cum quo utriuſque lateris et extremitatis tabulæ committantur."—In caſe the reader be not pleaſed with my verſion, I ſhall preſent him with thoſe of three of the moſt learned modern tranſlators. Houbigant: "Qui erunt ab imo ejus ad ſummum commiſſurâ perpetuâ conjugati, et annulo in uno hærebunt."—Dathe: *Qui vero ſint gemini, cum in imo tum in ſummo, et annulo invicem juncti.*—Michaëlis: "Die ortbretter ſollen " unten zweyſeitig, oben aber von der ſpitze bis zum erſten ringe herab, aufgeſchnitten und einfach ſeyn."

" number

" number of pieces which ought to have followed it. Theſe verſes make 25 lines in one of " the oldeſt Sam. MSS. and it is remarkable that 25 is the number of the lines alſo at Job, 40. " where the firſt fourteen verſes are a ſimilar diſlocation. Both theſe large tranſpoſitions " muſt have been made very early; and this in the Pentateuch happened before the time of " the Greek verſion, unleſs that verſion has been altered in conformity to the Hebrew."—I have no doubt that the Septuagint verſion has in many places been made conformable to the Hebrew ſince the days of Origen, and perhaps a purely genuine copy of its primitive exemplar exiſts not at preſent. See the Rem. on ch. 30. ver. 6.

PART OF CHAP. XXX.

Ver. 1. *An altar to burn incenſe upon.* Another Egyptian rite, adopted by the Hebrew legiſlator.—" The Egyptians," ſays Plutarch, " burn incenſe to the ſun thrice every day *."

Ver. 2. *Its horns.* See C. R. on ch. 27. 2.

Ver. 6. *And thou ſhalt place it,* &c. " The progreſs of error," ſays Kennicott, " in this " place is remarkable. The great error has been noted already, which is, that the firſt 10 " verſes now here belong to ch. 26. The ſecond error is, that here, in the 6th of theſe 10 " verſes, 6 words have been careleſsly expreſſed twice; though the 5th of them has been (in " the repetition) ſince omitted, except in a few MSS. But the chief circumſtance is, that " the word הפרכת. *the veil,* is changed to a word very different in ſenſe, though conſiſting of " the ſame letters (with one tranſpoſed), הכפרת, *the mercy-ſeat* †; and yet here 4 MSS. have " the word rightly expreſſed, that is, the ſame as *the veil.* The words here repeated are not in " the Sam. Text, nor in the Greek ‡ and Arabic § verſions; and 18 || Heb. MSS. confirm " theſe authorities. It muſt alſo be obſerved, that by this *corruption of a corruption* (the whole " repetition and the ſubſequent alteration of this one word) the Hebrew Text is now made " to contradict *itſelf* as well as the *Ep. to the Hebrews*; for it places the altar of incenſe *before* " (לפני *in the preſence of*) the *mercy-ſeat*; and if ſo, it muſt have been in *the Holy of Holies*; " whereas the altar of incenſe was attended *every day,* and yet the Holy of Holies was en- " tered but *once a year.*"—All this is very ſpecious, and the ſame conſiderations induced Houbigant to eject the ſecond comma as an interpolation. I am, nevertheleſs, inclined to think that there is not only no interpolation, but no corruption, in the paſſage. I believe, indeed, that a word is wanting in the preſent text, which however is ſupplied in at leaſt eight MSS.; namely, the word ארן, *ark.* I would alſo read ולפני, with above 80 MSS. and four of the moſt ant. editions ¶; although the text can do without it. The text thus arranged will give the

* Ἡμερας ἑκαστης τριχως επιθυμιωσι τῳ Ἡλιῳ. De Iſi et Oſiride. † That is, *the lid* or *cover* of the ark, which can ſignify *mercy-ſeat* only in a tralatitious ſenſe. ‡ So indeed the editions; but the Rom. editors tell us that other copies had the addition κατα προσωπον ἱλαστηριϖ, ὁ ες-ιν επι των μαρτυριων; and Canonici's MS. has this very reading, only του μαρτυριου for των μαρτυριων. I doubt not but other MSS. read ſimilarly. § This is true with reſpect to the Polyglott copy; but De Roſſi aſſures us that the ed. of Conſtantinople agrees with the preſent Hebrew. || De Roſſi reduces them to 17, but adds 9 of his own, beſide another in which the words are left unpointed, and marked with a note of abolition. ¶ Eleven copies of Onk. have likewiſe the copulative.

following

following literal verſion: *Et dabis illud ante velum quod* [*eſt*] *ante arcam teſtimonii*; *et e contra operculi arcæ teſtimonii.* There is here nothing redundant nor contradictory. The firſt comma directs the incenſe-altar to be placed before the veil; and the ſecond marks the preciſe place; namely, directly oppoſite to the lid of the ark, the ſuppoſed reſidence of Jehovah *. Before this reſidence, but without the veil, the incenſe-altar was to be placed, between the table of the preſence-bread and the chandelier †.

CHAP. XXVII.

Ver. 2. *Its horns.* קרנתיו. Michaëlis imagined that by *horns* here were meant no more than the corners themſelves of the altar; but this interpretation is incompatible with the context, as Dathe juſtly obſerves: "Quod miror a viro eruditiſſimo, cum gravi adeo inſcitiæ reprehen-
" ſione alterius ſententiæ, defendi; cum clare admodum hi [anguli] ab illis [cornubus] diſ-
" tinguantur *facies cornua ejus in quatuor ejus angulis:* ſed hæc verba ultima omittit vir celeb.
" in verſione ſua.... Equidem non aſſentiar iis, qui *cornuum* figuras in aræ angulis extitiſſe pu-
" tant, cujus ſententiæ argumenta non ſatis firma allata videntur: nec tamen קרנות cum פנות
" prorſus ſynonyma eſſe arbitror, ſed in quatuor angulis quatuor eminentias extitiſſe."—
They were evidently *projections* from the four corners; but whether upright, oblique, or curved, we learn not from the Text. I am inclined, however, to think, with Spencer, Le Clerc, Witſius, and others, that they were really horn-ſhaped, like thoſe of the *ara pacis* of the Romans. Joſephus expreſsly ſays ſo of the altar of his time: τετραγωνος δ' ἱδρυτο, κερατοειδεις προανεχων γωνιας ‡.

Ver. 3. *Its pans*, &c. All the copies of Sep. here ſtrangely deviate from both the Heb. and Sam. texts. The ſame number of utenſils are mentioned; but how to reconcile ϛεφανην with סרית §, καλυπτηρα with יעי, or φιαλας with מזרקות, I can ſee no device. I have given to the Heb. terms the beſt explication I could; but I will not aſſure that they are the beſt. Some think that יע is *a ſhovel*, and מחת *a chaffing-diſh*. Dathe's verſion is: *Ollæ ejus, ad cinerem accipiendum, palæ, pateræ, fuſcinæ, et batilla, omnia ejus vaſa ænea ſunto.* That of Michaëlis: "Aſchentöpfe, ſchaufeln, ſchalen, gabeln, kohlpfannen, und alle ſeine geräthſchaft
" aus kupfer machen laſſen."

Ver. 5. *And thou ſhalt place it.* What is the antecedent to it? According to the preſent Heb. text it is רשת, *lattice-work*; according to Sam. it is מכבר, *the grate:* but Sep. and Vulg. ſeem to have read neither אתה nor אתו, but אתם, or אתן, as they render in the plural ὑποθησεις αὐτους—*quos pones*; making טבות, *rings*, the antecedent: and, what is very remarkable, ſo Gr. Ven.: yet there is no MS. that ſo reads. In one Heb. MS. אתה is wanting.

* The whole verſe is well rendered by Gr. Ven.: Και δωσεις αυτο ενωπιον της αυλαιας, της επι της χηλου της μαρτυριας· ANTIKPY της σκεπης του επι [χηλου] της μαρτυριας. He read לפני without the copulative, and read not ארן before the laſt הערת: but he underſtood his Text. † The verſion of Dathe is clear and elegant: *Hanc aram collocabis ante ſiparium quod arcam legis tegit* [better perhaps *prætegit*], *e regione operculi quod ſuper illa arca eſt, unde tibi reſponſa dabo.* ‡ De Bell. Jud. lib. v. c. 5. n. 6. p. 324, ed. Havercamp. wrongly quoted by Spencer, lib. vi. § Perhaps for סיר they read זיר in their copy. They have nothing for לרשנו.

Ib.

Ib. *The altar-band.* כרכב; by Sep. rendered *την εσχαρην*. They ſeem to have read מכבר, or miſtook for it מרכב, which may be the original true reading. It is well rendered by Syr.: שפולוהי, *margins*. It evidently denotes the lower margin of the altar-band, which cloſed with the feet of the altar.

Ib. *So that the lattice may be at the middle of the altar.* Michaëlis ſuppoſes that the altar was formed in the ſhape of a capital H, and that the lower half was of grate-work round about, but that the upper half was occaſionally filled with earth, on which the victim was burned. I ſhould rather think that the form of the altar was this: its four legs, or angle-poſts, were three cubits high, and as much more as ſerved to make what are called its *horns*, which might be nothing more than the heads of the poſts tapered off to a point in the ſhape of a horn. Theſe angle-poſts were, at half-way down from the root of the horns, ſurrounded with a frame or band 1½ cubit broad; at the lower rim of which was fixed the lattice-work, or grate, ou which the faggots of wood, and then the victims, were laid.

Ver. 7. *Thou ſhalt put.* I follow the reading of Sam. הבאת, which was that of Sep. Vulg. Syr. and both Arabs. The preſent Heb. reading is הובא; by Pagninus rendered *adducentur*; and, after him, by moſt modern tranſlators; and, among others, by our own: "And the "ſtaves ſhall be put into the rings." But Luther and Caſtalio, who often paid a due regard to Sep. and Vulg. followed them here: "Und ſolt die ſtangen in die ringe thun:" *Quos per angulos immittes.* So Houbigant: *Vectes in annulos immittes.* In truth, the preſent reading, הובא את בדיו is a vile ſoleciſm. To make grammar, it ought to be הובאו, as in Gen. 43. 17. and I have no doubt that both Perſ. and Gr. Ven. had this reading before them. Onkelos ſeems to have read הביא, as he renders יעל *introducet* [aliquis]. On the whole the Sam. lection is far the more preferable, as all the concomitant injunctions are addreſſed to Moſes in the ſecond perſon.

Ver. 10. *With their twenty pillars.* The preſent texts, both Heb. and Sam. have *its pillars*, עומדיו; but the right reading, עומדיהם, was followed by Sep. and Saad.; and this is, in ver. 11 and 12, the reading of Sam. and in P. P. ch. 38. 10. the reading of both Sam. and Heb.—On the other hand, in

Ver. 16. Although both Texts have עומדיהם, followed by Sep. and moſt of the ant. tranſlators; yet I think we ſhould, with Jerom and Saadias, read עומדיו, *its pillars*, unleſs we alſo read קלעים, inſtead of מסך, or conſider the latter as a collective noun.

Ver. 18. *Its breadth fifty cubits.* So Sam.; חמשים באמה. But the preſent Heb. has חמשים בחמשים; a very early corruption, as it was followed by all the ant. tranſlators *, the Septuagint not excepted, if the preſent copies of their verſion be not alſo here corrupted. At any rate the Sam. reading is, in my apprehenſion, evidently the true one; for what ſenſe is there in ſaying that the breadth of the court was *fifty by fifty?*—O, ſay the Thargumiſts, the meaning is, that *the breadth of the court was fifty cubits at the eaſt ſide, and alſo fifty cubits at the weſt ſide*; or, as our Engliſh tranſlators render the Heb. "was fifty every where."—An admirable mode this of deſcribing the breadth of a court! Was the writer afraid leſt,

* Except, perhaps, Jerom, whoſe verſion is: *In longitudine occupabit atrium cubitos centum, in latitudine quinquaginta.* He either read not בחמשים, then, or neglected to render it. So Dathe: *Longitudo atrii ſit centum cubitorum, latitudo quinquaginta.*

without this בחמשים, his readers might have been led to think that the court was a trapezium, broader at one end than the other? But then why took he not the ſame precaution with reſpect to the length and height, and tell us that the former was *an hundred by an hundred*, and the latter *five by five?*

Ib. *The hangings of the court*, &c. That theſe and all the other words in Italics, which I have introduced into the text of my Tranſlation, have been dropped out of the original text and all the ant. verſions, is clear from the parallel place, ch. 38. 16. and from the evident baldneſs of the paſſage as it ſtands without them. The other additions in this chapter are ſupported by the authorities noticed among the Various Readings.

CHAP. XXVIII.

Ver. 1. *TO miniſter to me in the prieſt's office.* לכהן לי. For ſuch is the genuine Sam. reading, followed by Sep. ἱερατευειν μοι. So alſo Onk. and Tharg. לשמשא קדמי; and Syr. למכהנה; and ſo equivalently both Arabs; unleſs perhaps they found in their copies וכהנו, which comes to the ſame, and would be no improper reading. Aq. Sym. Theod. Perſ. and Gr. Ven. read with the preſent Text, and refer the *affix* ו to Aaron; but Montfaucon wrongly joins to them Vulg. which has *fungantur*, not *fungatur*. Let this remark apply to the ſame word in ver. 3 and 4.

Ver. 7. *At its two extremities ſhall the joining be.* I read יחבר with Sam. not וחבר, the preſent Hebrew reading. Perhaps יחברו is ſtill a better reading, and ſeems to have been that of Sep. Vulg. and Saad.

Ver. 8. *The fancy-work of the ſhoulder-pieces.* Inſtead of אפדתו I read אפדות, in the plural, with the Septuagint *, who render it by the ſame word as they had before employed to expreſs בתפות. Thoſe ſhoulder-pieces were *little ephods* annexed to the large one. They who render the word by *band*, *zone*, or *belt*, ſeem not to have attended to the context. They were probably deceived by Onk. and Syr. who probably miſtook חשב for חבש, or read the latter in their copies. And this indeed ſeems to have been the reading of the other interpreters †, except Vulg. and Gr. Ven. of which the former has *textura*, the latter λογισμα.

Of modern interpreters the greater part have *belt*, *girdle*, *cincture*; and among theſe is Michaëlis: but Le Clerc and Dathe, in my opinion, very properly contend that חשב has never that ſignification. The verſion of the former is: *Textura etiam partis oppoſitæ, quæ adjicietur, ex ipſo erit*, &c.: that of the latter, *Et textura anteriori parti oppoſita ex eadem materia ſit.* They both ſuppoſe that אפדה denotes the poſterior part of the ephod, in oppoſition to the anterior. Houbigant's tranſlation is: *Et textura* LIMBI *ejus, qui ſuper eum erit.* This meaning of אפדה he derives from the Arabic אפר, *terminus*; but I cannot but agree with Dathe that this is a forced etymon. On the whole I am perſuaded that the Septuagint have given the true meaning; and that אפדות here denotes ſhoulder-pieces which were affixed to the ephod for greater ornament, ſomewhat like our *epaulettes*. Yet I will not be contentious about the matter.

* Και το ὑφασμα των ΕΠΩΜΙΔΩΝ, ὁ εστιν επ' αυτῳ. † Joſeph. both Arabs and Perſ.

Ver. 9.

Ver. 9. *Onyx-ſtones.* See the Rem. on ver. 18—21.

Ver. 11. *Thou ſhalt engrave on the two ſtones the names of the ſons of Iſrael.* תפתח את שתי האבנים על שמות בני ישראל. Lit. "Thou ſhalt open the two ſtones over the names of the "ſons of Iſrael;" which ſeems to indicate that the names were firſt marked on the ſtones, and the parts thus marked carved out.

Ver. 14. *Of equal length.* מגבלות. Evidently derived from גבל; but what preciſe meaning it has here, it is hard to ſay. I have followed that which appears to be moſt agreeable to the context, and in which it was underſtood by both Arabs; for I cannot fall in with the opinion of Michaëlis, that the *thickneſs* * of the chains is hereby indicated. The Septuagint ſeem to have read another word in their copy, or to have had in view the Chald. meaning, *miſcuit*, as they render καταμεμιγμενα εν ανθεσιν, "intermingled with flowers." Vulg. *ſibi invicem cohærentes.* Houbigant: *forma tortili implexas.* Junius: *æquabiles.* Dathe: *æquales.* Our common verſion: "at the ends †."

Ver. 16. *Doubled.* כפול. In my Expl. Note I have expreſſed a doubt about the ſignification of this word, and I ſtill think it may only mean that the breaſt-plate was a *perfect*, or *equilateral, ſquare.* Among other ſignifications in Arabic, כפל denotes *parity, ſimilitude,* &c. yet as all the antient interpreters have otherwiſe explained it, I have followed them. It may have been made *double* for ſtrength, the better to ſuſtain the weight of the precious ſtones that were to be placed in it.

Ver. 17. In this and the three following verſes we have the names of different gems which were ſet on the pectoral, which I have rendered according to the beſt of my knowledge; but as many of them are but bare probabilities, I ſubjoin the original names, with the principal various verſions that have been made of them.

1. אדם. This appears from its etymon to have been a gem of a reddiſh colour; and Onk. Tharg. Syr. both Arabs, and the Sam. tranſlator, have contented themſelves with words denoting the ſame colour: סמק—אחמר—סומקא—סמקתא—סמקון. The Septuagint, Joſephus, and Vulg. have σαρδιον—σαρδονυξ—*lapis ſardius:* the Perſic יאקות, the *ruby:* and Gr. Ven. ανθραξ, the *carbuncle.* Moſt modern interpreters are for the *ſardius*, or *carnelian* ‡, which I have adopted in my verſion.

2. פטרה. It is generally agreed that this is the *topaz.* So Sep. Joſeph. and Vulg. τοπαζιον—τοπαζος—*topazius.* The other Oriental verſions have words that denote a light *greeniſh, glaſs-colour.* Onk. ירקן—Tharg. ירקתא—Syr. זרגא—Arab. Erp. אחצר—except Saad. and Perſ. both which have words that are ſuppoſed to ſignify the *emerald*—זמרד—אלמאס; and ſo Gr. Ven. σμαραγδος.—Moſt of the modern interpreters have *topaz.*

3. ברקת. That this was ſome *ſplendid ſhining gem,* we may conclude from the meaning of its root, ברק; but as moſt gems are more or leſs ſplendid, this is no certain criterion. The

* From the Arab. גבל, *craſſus.* Were I to derive it from any other dialect than the Hebr. I would prefer the Syr. גבל, *fixit—compegit, compact, complex*—which might be reconciled with the Greek καταμεμιγμενα. † From the old French of Geneva, "aux deux extremitez;" but the reviſed verſion has "en façon de cordon." Le Gros: "qui ſe termineront par un bout." See other verſions in Poole's *Synopſis*, or in Calmet. ‡ So Pagninus, Luther, Caſtalio, the French of Geneva, the Dutch, Houbigant, Dathe, Michaëlis, and our common Engliſh verſion.—Junius, Jarhi, and ſome other Rabbis, are for the *ruby.* The Greek of Venice ſtands alone.

Septuagint, Joſephus, and Jerom, took it to be the *emerald*, σμαραγδος, *ſmaragdus*. Onk. Tharg. and Syr. retain the Heb. word, and are conſequently equally ambiguous. Not leſs ſo are the other verſions, except Gr. Ven. which has χρυσολιθος *. Our Engliſh tranſlation, with ſome others, have *carbuncle*. I ſee no reaſon to depart from Sep. The *emerald* is deſcribed by lithologiſts to be a very ſplendid gem: "non mutatur ſole, non umbra, non lu-" cernis, ſed ſemper eſt radians." Plin. lib. xxxvii. c. 5. It could not, then, have a more appropriate Heb. name than ברקת.

4. נפך. Sep. and Joſ. ανθραξ. Vulg. *carbunculus*. Onk. ſeems to have had in view the emerald, as he renders the word אזמרגדין, which in the Polyglott is tranſlated (I know not why) *carbunculus*.—The Thargums here diſagree: Bab. has איזמורד, an *emerald*; but Jeruſ. has כרכדנא †. Syr. and Saad. have words that denote the *jacinth*. Erp. and Gr. Ven. the *onyx*. Moſt moderns follow Sep. and Vulg.; and perhaps this is the beſt thing we can do.

5. ספיר. That this is the *ſapphire*, there is little or no doubt. Sep. σαπφειρος ‡.—Vulg. *ſapphirus*—and ſo the general run of commentators, both antient and modern.

6. יהלם. This is commonly rendered a *diamond*; but by Sep. ιασπις. So Vulg. *iaſpis*. The other ant. verſions vary; and all are mere gueſs-work. Againſt the *diamond* it has been objected that it is too hard to be engraved upon; but Büſching aſſerts that ſuch *diamonds* exiſt, and may be ſeen in ſome muſeums. I doubt very much, however, if there were any ſuch diamond on the breaſt-plate of Aaron. The argument, in favour of the diamond, derived from etymology, is but weak. It is ſo called, ſay lexicographers, becauſe it breaks all other gems, and cannot be broken by any; from הלם, *contundere*. The argument would be juſt as good for a ſtone of a quite oppoſite quality, namely, one that could be eaſily broken; for הלם means *contundi* as well as *contundere*; and indeed I am apt to think that the *cryſtal* is here meant. Michaëlis and Dathe retain the Hebrew name *jahalom*.

7. לשם. Rendered by Sep. λιγυριον, by Joſ. λιγυρος, and by Vulg. *ligurius*; whoſe joint authority I prefer to that of the other verſions, which vary and are ambiguous. Moſt moderns are agreed that it is the *ligure*.

8. שבו. Sep. αχατης. Vulg. *achates*. Joſephus has here αμεθυσος; but I believe this to be only a tranſpoſition (as before in the ſecond triad), as he has αχατης immediately after.—Of the other ant. verſions ſome have the *beryl* and ſome the *ſapphire*. The moderns are in general for the *agate* §.

9. אחלמה. Sep. αμεθυσος: Vulg. *amethyſtus*: which has been adopted by almoſt all the moderns.

10. תרשיש. Sep. and Joſ. χρυσολιθος: Vulg. *chryſolithus*: adopted by moſt interpreters; but, with Abarbanel, I believe it to be the *beryl*.

11. שהם. That this is the *onyx* ||, or *ſardonyx*, interpreters are nearly agreed. Abarbanel and the Gr. Ven. took it to be the *cryſtal*; others the *beryl*.

* From Jerom we learn that Symmachus had κεραυνιος. † So the Polyglott; but I find, in an ant. edition of Venice, כרכנא; and I ſuſpect, with Ugolini, that the original reading was כרכדנא, the ſame with the *charchedonius* of Pliny; that is, the *carbuncle*. ‡ Joſephus has here ιασπιν; unleſs the word has been tranſpoſed, for σαπφειρον follows it. § The Greek of Venice here agrees with Sep. in all the three names of the third row: στιχος δε ὁ τριτος, λιγυριον, αχατης και αμεθυσος: and ſo perhaps Saadias. || I ſuſpect that there is here a tranſpoſition in Sep.; and that ονυχιον ſtood originally before βηρυλλιον, as it is in Vulg. and Joſephus.

12. ישפה.

12. ישפה. There is little doubt of this being the *jaſper*; yet Joſephus and Jerom have βηρυλλος, *beryllus*; and, if we ſuppoſe a tranſpoſition in Sep. that is alſo their reading.

I ſhall conclude in the words of a ſenſible and modeſt Rabbi *.—" For my part, I confeſs " my ignorance of the particular ſpecies of precious ſtones here mentioned, and wonder at " the confuſion which I ſee in Onkelos and the other Thargumiſts."—This learned Jew thinks that the moſt probable names of the twelve gems are, the *carnelian*, the *topaz*, the *ceraunia*, the *carbuncle*, the *ſapphire*, the *diamond*, the *turcheſia* or *turquoiſe*, the *jacinth*, the *onyx*, the *chryſolite*, the *emerald*, and the *jaſper*.

Ver. 21. The text here only tells us that the names of the ſons of Iſrael were engraven on thoſe gems: but the Jewiſh interpreters go farther, and pretend to tell us what name was inſcribed on each particular gem. In this, however, they are not agreed. According to both the Thargums, the names of REUBEN, SIMEON, and LEVI, were written on the firſt row. On the ſecond were written the names of JUDAH, DAN, and NEPHTHALI, according to Tharg. Bab.; but, according to Jeruſ. JUDAH, ISSACHAR, and ZEBULON. On the third row, according to Bab. were the names of GAD, ASHER, and ISSACHAR; but, according to Jeruſ. DAN, NEPHTHALI, and GAD. On the fourth row, according to Bab. were written the names of ZEBULON, JOSEPH, and BENJAMIN; but, according to Jeruſ. ASHER, JOSEPH, and BENJAMIN.—But Abarbanel arranges them in the following order: JUDAH, ISSACHAR, ZEBULON, REUBEN, SIMEON, GAD, EPHRAIM, MANASSEH, BENJAMIN, DAN, ASHER, NEPHTHALI.—He pretends that they were thus arranged, agreeably to their mode of marching, under four different ſtandards, as is related in Numb. 2. But in this, I believe, he is deſerted by all his brethren.

Ver. 22. I have in my verſion incloſed this verſe in brackets, as I ſuſpect it to be an interpolation. If it be not, the chains here mentioned are either the ſame with thoſe of ver. 14, or met them half way; for Houbigant's idea, that the former, like the cords of a deacon's *dalmatic* †, ſerved to widen or tighten the neck of the ephod, is hardly compatible with the text.

After ver. 22. Sep. Rom. Ald. Alex. have what is, in the Heb. ver. 29, and then proceed thus: Και θησεις επι το λογειον της κρισεως τους κρωσσους—τα αἱλυσιδωτα επ' αμφοτερων των κλιτων τω λογειου επιθησεις. The firſt colon is a part of ver. 23, and the ſecond colon the ſubſtance of ver. 24. But, after this, the whole of ver. 25, 26, 27, and 28, is wanting ‡. They are, however, in the Complutenſian edition, and in the Oxf. and Canon. MSS. with ſome variety of reading of little moment, and they will probably be found in other copies, when Dr. Holmes's collations appear. The reader who is curious to ſee the Greek of theſe verſes may conſult Bos, who has given an exact tranſcript of Complut. except that κρωσσους, with an *omega*, is twice put for κροσσους, which is a better reading than that of Ald. and Rom. and is alſo that of Alex.

* Rabbi Abraham Ben David; whoſe *Diſſertatio de Veſtitu Sacerdotum Hebræorum* was publiſhed, in Hebrew and Latin, by Ugolini, in his 13th vol. of Heb. Antiquities. The curious reader may conſult this well-written tract; Ugolini's *Sacerdotium Hebraicum*, in the ſame volume; and the well-known work of Braunius, *De Veſtitu Sacerd. Hebr.*

† An official veſtment worn by deacons and ſubdeacons of the Romiſh church.

‡ The whole is likewiſe wanting in Glaſg.

Ver. 29.

Ver. 29. This verſe ſeems here out of its place. In moſt copies of Sep. it is immediately after ver. 22, where it certainly comes in more naturally; but it would be ſtill more naturally placed after ver. 21; and, if verſe 22 be deemed an interpolation, that would, in the Greek, be its place. The text then would run thus: Ver. 21. "The ſtones ſhall be, for the names "of the ſons of Iſrael, twelve, according to their names: the engravings, *like thoſe* of a ſig-"net, ſhall have each its *peculiar* name, according to the twelve tribes." Ver. 29. "And Aa-"ron, when he goeth into the ſanctuary, ſhall bear on his heart the names of the ſons of Iſrael, "*that* are on the judicial breaſt-plate, as a perpetual memorandum before the Lord."—Every one ſees that the words are here moſt ſuitable to the context, whereas they come in ſomewhat awkwardly after ver. 28.

Ver. 30. URIM *and* THUMIM. את האורים ואת התומים. What ſort of ornaments were theſe? It is hard even to gueſs, and perhaps impoſſible to gueſs with any degree of certainty. If we attend to the grammatical meaning of the Hebrew words they ſignify LIGHTS* and PERFECTIONS; that is, I ween, *knowledge* and *integrity:* two qualifications highly neceſſary for a ſupreme teacher and judge, ſuch as the high-prieſt was meant to be.—By Sep. the words are rendered ΔΗΛΩΣΙΝ *και* ΑΛΗΘΕΙΑΝ: by Jerom, DOCTRINAM et VERITATEM: by Onk. and Tharg. ית אוריא וית תומיא, equivalent in meaning to the Hebrew: by Syr. נהירא ושלמא, much to the ſame purport: by Saad. אלאנואר ואלצחאיח, a literal verſion of the Heb. and in the plural number: Arab. Erp. אלאנואר ואלצחאיח, equally literal: Perſ. retains the very Heb. words: Gr. Ven. *την εμφανειαν και την τελειοτητα.*

But none of theſe renderings give us any explanation of the nature of the *Urim* and *Thumim*, of what materials they were compoſed, or what was their form. Hence various conjectures have been made. Braunius, and others, have laboured to prove that the *Urim* and *Thumim* were the precious ſtones themſelves; and that the words, being both in the plural, denote *the moſt perfect ſplendor*, which muſt have ariſen from ſuch a variety of gems. They fancy that two parallel places are favourable to their opinion: Exod. 39. 8. and Levit. 8. 8. In the former, ſay they, where the breaſt-plate is fully deſcribed, there is no mention made of the *Urim* and *Thumim*; and in the latter the *Urim* and *Thumim* only are mentioned, without any notice of the precious ſtones. But the anſwer is obvious. In Exod. 39. 8. there was no need of deſcribing the *Urim* and *Thumim* as part of the breaſt-plate, as they were indeed no part of it; they were only placed over it. But in Levit. 8. 8. they are very properly mentioned, not as a part of the breaſt-plate, but as ſomething evidently diſtinct from it: "Over it [the robe] he "put the ephod and the breaſt-plate, which he faſtened to the fancy-work of the ephod; and "on [*or* over] the breaſt-plate he put the *Urim* and *Thumim*."—It is remarkable that, in ch. 28, after ver. 30. the Sam. exemplar has this addition: "Thou ſhalt alſo make the URIM and "THUMIM †;" which why it ſhould be an interpolation, I ſee no ſolid reaſon. But, be that as it may, to me it appears evident that the Urim and Thumim were not the gems of the breaſt-plate, nor any part of the breaſt-plate properly ſo called.

* Spencer thinks that the word would be better rendered *fires*; but his reaſons are far from being cogent.

† And again, ch. 39. 22. "They alſo made the Urim and Thumim, as the Lord had given in command to "Moſes."

Michaëlis

Michaelis imagined that the *Urim* and *Thumim* were *three lots*, in uſe among the Hebrews, long before this period; one of which was *affirmative*, another *negative*, and the third *neuter*—that the breaſt-plate was made double, in the form of a purſe, to receive thoſe lots; which, when drawn, announced the divine will or left it dubious.—Mere imagination!

Moſt rational is the opinion of Spencer; namely, that the Urim and Thumim were little images, or *theraphs*; and that the idea was borrowed from the Egyptians. From Ælian, indeed, we learn that the Egyptian prieſts were at the ſame time judges; and that the arch-prieſt wore about his neck an image of ſapphire-ſtone, called TRUTH *, the very word which is employed by the Septuagint and Jerom to expreſs the Hebrew *Thumim*. Whether the high-prieſt of the Hebrews wore two figures, one repreſenting *knowledge*, the other *integrity*, or whether, as Spencer thinks, they were both but one figure, is a matter of controverſy; but that they were figures, or a figure, of ſome kind, appears to me clear from a paſſage of Hoſeah, 3. 4. "For the children of Iſrael ſhall be many days without a king and without a chief, "without ſacrifice and without an altar †, and without an ephod and theraphs:" where *theraphs*, or *theraphim*, is equivalent to the *Urim* and *Thumim* of Exodus.—The hiſtory of Michah, Jud. 17. leads to the ſame concluſion; for, whether we ſuppoſe that his *ephod* and *theraphs* were made for an idolatrous purpoſe or not ‡, it is clear that they were made in imitation of the high-prieſt's garniture; and that *theraphs* there, as in Hoſeah, are equivalent to the *Urim* and *Thumim*.

One is apt to wonder that the materials and form of the Urim and Thumim are not as minutely deſcribed as the other ornaments; but this is no weak proof that they were not a novel thing, and that they were well known to the Iſraelites before. The uſe of *theraphs*, in religion, is of great antiquity. Rahel ſtole the theraphs of her father, which he calls his gods. Gen. 31. 30. The Egyptians had their *ſeraps*, or *ſeraphs*; which, with Kircher, I take to be the very ſame with the Hebrew theraphs §. I know that Spencer and others will not allow that *theraphim* is an Egyptian word, but think that it is the ſame with *ſeraphim* ‖; but

* Δικαζαι δε, το αρχαιον, παρ Αιγυπτιοις ιερεις ησαν· ην δε τουτων αρχων ὁ πρεσβυτατος και εδικαζεν απαντας· εδε δε αυτον ειναι δικαιατατον ανθρωπων και αφειδεστατον· ειχε δε και ΑΓΑΛΜΑ περι τον αυχενα, εκ σαπφειρου λιθου, και εκαλειτο αγαλμα ΑΛΗΘΕΙΑ. Ælian. Var. Hiſt. lib. xiv. c. 33. See alſo Dion. Hal. lib. i. c. 3. or Spencer, lib. iii. diſſert. vii. c. 1. where the ſubject is almoſt exhauſted. † The preſent Heb. Text has מצבה, a *ſtatue*. But the true reading is evidently מובח. ‡ See the Rem. on that place. § "Erant autem Ægyptiis ſimu-"lacra quædam pueri ſpecie, quæ vocabantur nomine Ægyptiaco SERAPIS: hæc adorabant illi, de futuris et abſcon-"ditis ea interrogantes. Omnibus in locis celebrioribus urbium ea collocabant, adolentes ante ea, ſecum quoque ea "contra eventus malorum portare ſolebant. Atque hæc idola ſimilia ſunt THERAPHIM, quæ Iſraelitæ colebant, et "quæ Laban adoraſſe Scriptura memorat; et dicitur, quod domeſtici Abraham, in Ægypto commorantes, ea ſecum "reduces attulerunt." Abenephius apud Kircher. Synag. iv. c. iii. vol. i. p. 259; who adds: "Atque ex his colli-"gitur, hos Hebræorum *Theraphim* nihil aliud fuiſſe quam *Serapes* Ægyptiorum, cum non duntaxat nomine, ſed forma, "ritibuſque queis colebantur hujus modi idola in omnibus ſibi exactè correſpondeant." ‖ "Fortaſſe *theraphim* "angelorum fuerunt imagines, aut angelis dicatæ. Unde ſpiritus angelicus eas ſubibat, ac conſulentibus per eas ora-"cula edebant. Ex hac conjectura תרפים mihi idem eſſet quod שרפים, notiſſimum angelorum nomen." Ludovic. de Dieu in Gen. 31. 19.—So alſo Gaffarellus (apud Spencer) opinatur "Theraphim figuras fuiſſe a Moſe legiſlatore "permiſſas, a Labane aliiſque Orientalibus ante legem pie uſurpatos, quibus mediantibus voluntatem ſuam Deus non "raro patefecit: et cherubinorum et ſeraphinorum figuras fuiſſe generis ejuſdem."

their

their arguments are far from being convincing, and the opinion of Kircher is, in my apprehenſion, much more rational.

It will be aſked, perhaps, how oracles, or divine reſponſes, were given by means of the *Urim* and *Thumim*. To this queſtion I muſt plead my ignorance, and with others only give my own conjecture. The Thalmudiſts, who believe that the Urim and Thumim were the ſame with the ſtones of the breaſt-plate, tell us that the names of the twelve patriarchs engraved on thoſe ſtones, together with the names of Abraham, Iſaac, and Jacob; and moreover theſe words, כל אלה שבטי ישראל; contain all the elements neceſſary for forming any individual word of the Hebrew language; and that when the high-prieſt, wearing them on his ephod, turned his face to the ark, the letters on the pectoral became alternately more ſplendid than uſual, from which the prieſt combined his reſponſes as we combine the ſignals of a telegraph.

Others, who cannot ſwallow this Thalmudical camel, as Spencer calls it, are of opinion, that when the prieſt, veſted with his ephod, invoked God after a certain known form, his mind was illuminated by the Holy Ghoſt, and his reſponſes thereby became thoſe of Heaven. This was the opinion of Kimhi and Bechai among the Jews, and of ſeveral Chriſtian commentators, of whom I ſhall only quote below the words of Rivet *.

A third opinion is that of Joſephus, adopted by Chryſoſtom, Theodoret, Auſtin, Suidas, Grotius, and ſome others; namely, that both the onyx-ſtones on the ſhoulder of the ephod and the twelve gems on the breaſt-plate revealed the will of God by changing their colour, and becoming brighter than uſual when a favourable reſponſe was given. Των γαρ λιθων ὁυς επι των ωμων φερειν τον αρχιερεα προειπον, συνεβαινε λαμπειν, ὁποτε ταις ἱερουργιαις ὁ Θεος παρειει, τον ἑτερον τον επι τῳ δεξιῳ των ωμων πεπορπημενον, αυγης αποπηδωσης και τοις ρορρωτατῳ φαινομενης, ου προτερον ταυτης ὑπαρχουσης τῳ λιθῳ . . . . ὁ δ'εξι τετε θαυμασιωτερον ερω· δια γαρ των δωδεκα λιθων, ὁυς κατα στερνον ὁ αρχιερευς ενερραμενους τῳ Εσσηνῃ Φορει, νικην μελλουσι πολεμειν προεμηνυεν ὁ Θεος· τοσαυτη γαρ απηστραπτεν απ' αυτων αυγη, μηπω της ςρατιας κεκινημενης, ὡς τῳ πληθει παντι γνωριμον ειναι το ωαρειναι τον Θεον εις την επικουριαν. Ant. lib. iii. c. 8. n. 9.

Spencer, after having copiouſly treated on the ſubject in fifty-five folio pages, ſums up his own opinion in a few words thus: "Dicam verbo, aſſerit hypotheſis mea, Deum e pectorali "voce formata reſpondiſſe, mediante ſimulachro præſentia angelica animato, et in hominis "ſorte ſpeciem efficto; utpote organo, quo nullum, ad vocem formandam vel præſentiam "illam indicandam, magis aptum et decorum, aut oracula tradendi modo in ſancto ſanctorum "uſitato magis conforme fingi poteſt."—According to this hypotheſis, the *Urim* and *Thumim* was but one and the ſame little puppet, incloſed in the breaſt-plate as in a purſe, and which, animated by an angel, whiſpered articulate reſponſes in the ears of the high-prieſt, who communicated them to the people.

Spectatum admiſſi, riſum teneatis amice!

* "Non abſurdum videtur, ſi dicamus, ex pacto et promiſſione inſtitutoris, Deum invocatum a ſacerdote certo ritu, "gemmas illas geſtante, reſpondiſſe non articulata aliqua voce, ſed per illuminationem intellectus illius, et certam per"ſuaſionem inditam menti ipſius de veritate reſponſi: nullam itaque vim fuiſſe in lapidibus, niſi tanquam in morali "cauſa: a Deo fuiſſe effectum, qui ad illius præſentiam operabatur occulto quodam modo." Rivet. in Exod. 28. 30.

Perhaps

Perhaps ye will equally laugh at my own opinion, which is, that the *Urim* and *Thumim* were indeed little images, or a little image, like that worn by the Egyptian prieſts, and hanging from the neck of the wearer over the breaſt-plate, but which neither ſpoke, nor moved, nor changed their colour: they were mere emblems of the two-fold duty of a ſacerdotal judge, *Truth* and *Integrity*; and the reſponſes given by the high-prieſt were, moſt probably, ſuch as in his own beſt judgment were proper for the occaſion; and he might readily be ſuppoſed by the people to be divinely inſpired, when, robed in his pontificals, he ſpoke in his judicial capacity; much in the ſame manner as the Pope is, by many Roman Catholics, ſuppoſed to be infallible when he ſpeaks *ex cathedra*, and, as they term it, *clavi non errante*. The figures might, originally, have been merely emblematical; but ſuperſtition is ever buſy in perverting original ideas, and what was at firſt an innocent, perhaps a uſeful, repreſentation, becomes gradually an idle, and often a profane, ceremony. Thus the crucifix, intended at firſt as a ſimple memorial of the death of Chriſt, obtained by degrees what was called a *relative worſhip*, and at length a direct ſpecies of adoration that ſeemed to border on idolatry. The Roman Catholics of the preſent age generally diſclaim all ſuch worſhip, yet veſtiges of the doctrine ſtill remain in their liturgical books; and, unleſs the terms be ſoftened by ingenious explanations, they are highly hyperbolical.

Ver. 36. *A petal of pure gold.* ציץ זהב טהור. The word ציץ is variouſly rendered. Sep. and Gr. Ven. πεταλον—Vulg. *laminam*—Onk. and Tharg. ציצא—Syr. כליאל, *a crown*—Both Arabs, עצאבה, *a fillet*—Sam. Verſ. טס, *a plate*—Perſ. گلی, *a flower*.—That ציץ denotes a flower, there is no doubt; or at leaſt ſome part of a flower: and Joſephus aſſerts that the flower which this ornament reſembled is the *hen-bane*, or *hyoſcyamus* *: but as he probably deſcribes the mitre, or turban, as it was worn by the high-prieſt of his own time, we cannot be certain that it was exactly the ſame with that of Aaron, eſpecially as he makes the plate of gold, on which was the inſcription, a different ornament from the flower, whereas the text of Exodus ſays it was on the ציץ. By ציץ, then, and by the πεταλον of Sep. I would underſtand the flower-leaf, or *petal*, of ſome ſplendid flower, imitated in gold, on which were written the words קדש ליהוה, HOLY TO THE LORD; or, as ſome render, HOLINESS TO THE LORD. —Sep. ἉΓΙΑΣΜΑ ΚΥΡΙΟΥ—Vulg. SANCTUM DOMINO—And ſo equivalently all the other ant. verſions; even Gr. Ven. ἁγιον τῳ οντωτῃ. Our firſt Engliſh tranſlations have "The holi-"neſs of the Lord," with Luther, Junius, the Dutch, and others; but our laſt reviſors followed Pagninus, the Genevans, and Tigurines: *Sanctitas Domino—La ſainčteté à l'Eternel —Sanctitas ipſi Jehovæ*.—More properly Caſtalio: *Jovæ ſacrum:* adopted by Dathe.—Michaëlis: *Dem Jehova heilig*.—Houbigant, with Vulg.: *Sanctum Domino*.

Ver. 39. *The tight tunic, and the mitre, thou ſhalt make of cotton.* The Hebrew is: ושבצת תכתנת שש ועשית מצנפת שש: literally rendered, by Montanus, *Et ſtringes tunicam byſſi, et facies cydarim byſſi*; and, by our Engliſh tranſlators, "And thou ſhalt embroider the coat of fine "linen; and thou ſhalt make the mitre *of* fine linen."—The Syriac tranſlator ſeems to have had before him a different reading, as he renders ועבד כותינא בוצא, *and make a tunic of byſſus.*

* Περιερχεται δε στεφανος χρυσεος, επι τριστοιχιαν κεχαλκευμενος· θαλλει δ' επ' αυτῳ καλυξ χρυσεος τῃ σακχαρῳ βοτανῃ παρ' ἡμιν λεγομενῃ απομεμιμημενος, υος δε κυαμου Ελληνων οἱ περι τομας ριζων εμπειρως εχοντες προσαγορευεσιν. Ant. lib. iii. c. 7. n. 6.

Did he read ועשית inſtead of שבצת, or conſider the latter as equivalent? This verſion led me to imagine that the original reading might be ועשית הכתנת תשבץ; and I rendered accordingly; ſo much the more readily as there was no danger of making a great miſtake. But, from poſterior conſiderations, I am apt to think that the Text is ſound, but that its meaning has been generally miſtaken. All the antient tranſlators conſidered שבצת as a verb, except the Septuagint, who render και αι κοσυμβωτοι* των χιτωνων εκ βυσσου. In like manner they had rendered תשבץ, in ver. 4, κοσυμβωτον. Scharfenberg ſuſpects that they read משבצית. They certainly conſidered it as a noun, and both it and כיתכות in the plural number; but it is not ſo clear that they read משבצות. They may have read שבצות; for שבצת may be a noun from שבץ, in the form of אַדֶרֶת from אדר. But, ſtill, what is the meaning of κοσυμβωτοι, or κοσυμβοι? It is rendered *nodi* by Nobilius. According to others it is the ſame with κροσσος *fimbria*. From Pollux we learn, that the Athenians, inſtead of κοσυμβος, or κοσυμβη, uſed κρωβυλος, or κρωβυλη, a *hair-net*, or *top-knot* †. I believe the radical meaning of the word is to be found in the Syriac and Arabic שבץ, *to mingle, intermix, perplex:* hence metaphorically *anguiſh, uneaſineſs, perplexity*. Adhering to its literal ſignification, then, the שבצת of Exodus may be rendered two ways; as a verb, or as a noun. The Sam. text is evidently for a verb, as it has ושבצת את הכיתונת; and this is followed by Houbigant and Dathe, *Et texes tunicam*. But I am inclined to prefer the Heb. reading, which wants את, and which was not read by Sep. and to take the preceding שבצת for a noun: "The texture of the tunic ſhall be of cot-" ton:" or, if the word be ſuppoſed to ſignify a *fringe* or *trimming*, (which I queſtion,) the verſion might be either "Let the fringe of the tunic be cotton, or "Thou ſhalt fringe the "tunic with cotton."

Ver. 40. *Turbans.* מגבעות. It is a different word from that which denotes the *mitre* of Aaron, namely, מצנפת; and the turbans of the inferior prieſts were probably of a different form; yet the Septuagint render both by the ſame word κιδαρις, and Jerom by *tiara* ‡; but all the other verſions diſtinguiſh them. Here Onk. and Tharg. have כובעין, of the ſame meaning with the Hebrew—Syr. כלוא, *caps*—Saad. קלאנס, *coifs*—Erp. ברארת, *biretta, caputia*, ſtill called in Italian *berretta* §, and *barrette* in French—Sam. Verſ. מגבען; the Heb. word Samaritanized—Perſ. טקיהא, *caps*—Gr. Ven. κρανους, *head-pieces*.

Ver. 41. *Initiate them in their office.* מלאת את ידם. Lit. *thou ſhalt fill their hand*; that is, thou ſhalt give them power to fulfil their reſpective offices, by putting in their hands the implements of their various functions. We have an Engliſh word which well expreſſes the thing, to *handſel*; but I fear it would be deemed vulgar. According to the Roman Ponti-

* In the Polyglott it is wrongly printed κωσυμβωτοι. Ald. Compl. and Alex. have κοσυμβοι. According to Montfaucon and the Roman Scholia, Aq. Sym. and Theod. had αι συσφιγξεις; but Scharfenberg, with reaſon, believes that they wrote και συσφιγξεις, and that this latter word is not a noun, but the 2. p. f. of the future of συσφιγγω; they are, therefore, to be ranked with thoſe who conſidered שבצת to be a verb. † Of the other verſions, Vulg. has *ſtringes:* Onk. תורמין, rendered in Pol. *ſtringes*, but by Buxtorf *teſſelatam facies*. I believe the meaning to be as uncertain as that of the Heb. word, which is retained in Tharg. Saad. וש, and Erp. תעין, both denoting *embroidering*, making *aliad-holes*. Perſ. زر كوفته, *gold-wove*; as if the *tunic*, or, as he calls it, the *ſhirt*, بيرهن, had been made of *brocade*. Gr. Ven. φολιδωσεις; a word of his own making perhaps, from φολις, a *ſcale, ſquama*; and metaphorically *variegation*, ποικιλμα. ‡ Nor is any difference made by Joſephus. § "Copertura del capo, di-" verſa dal capello, che ſi fa in varie foggie, e di diverſi drappi." Dict. Cruſc.

fical,

fical, a door-keeper, *oſtiarius*, is initiated by touching with his right hand the keys of the church; a lector by touching the book of leſſons; an exorciſt by touching a book of exorciſms, or a miſſal; an acolyte by touching a candleſtick with an unlighted candle in it, and an empty cruet *; a ſub-deacon by touching an empty chalice and paten, two cruets with wine and water in them, a ſmall baſon and napkin †, and a book of the epiſtles that are read throughout the year; a deacon by touching a book of the goſpels; a prieſt by receiving into his hands a chalice with wine and water in it, and above it a paten with a wafer on it; and a biſhop by receiving a paſtoral ſtaff, a ring, and a book of the goſpels. All this, in the language of the Hebrews, might be called *filling their hands* ‡.

Ver. 42. *Wrappers of linen.* מכנסי בד. This is the firſt time that the word בד occurs with reſpect to clothing, and on the authority of Sep. and Vulg. it has been generally believed to ſignify linen. That opinion I followed in this part of my verſion; but I am now convinced that the word cannot mean *linen* made of *flax*; which, whether raw or manufactured, is uniformly expreſſed by פשת. Beſides, it is clear, from ch. 39. 28. that theſe *wrappers*, or *drawers*, were made of *byſſus*, שש; but שש has been ſhewn to denote *cotton*: בד, therefore, cannot ſignify *linen*. It was this conſideration that made me change my opinion, but too late to correct my verſion of the preſent verſe. I now think that בד denotes ſomething *ſingular*, either in the *make* or *uſe* of the garment to which it is joined. If from the preſent paſſage, and others in which the words occur in the Pentateuch only, we were to form a deciſion, I ſhould certainly think that it implied nothing more than a piece of clothing, of *ſingular* and *peculiar* uſe, which the prieſt was to wear when employed in his ſacred functions: and this would perfectly agree with the radical ſignification of בדד. But from other paſſages of Scripture one might imagine that its ſingularity was derived from its *fineneſs*. David, at the removal of the ark, was clothed with a veſtment of בד, which the Greek tranſlator renders στολην εξαλλον, *an uncommonly fine robe*; Arab. גבה מן דמקס; and myſelf *a precious ephod*. See C. R. 2 Sam. 6. 14. Braunius and Michaëlis think that בד and שש are one and the ſame thing; but this cannot be, as in Exod. 39. they are both mentioned together: מכנסי הבד שש. I would rather ſay that הבד here expreſſes the fineneſs of the *cotton*, than that it is a mere pleonaſm; and in that caſe it would ſtill come into the idea of *ſingularity*, and preſerve its genuine etymon.

CHAP. XXIX.

Ver. 5. *WHICH thou ſhalt faſten to the fancy-work of the ephod.* ואפדת לו בחשב האפד. Lit. *Thou ſhalt faſten to it the ephod at the fancy-work*; for ſo, I think, we ought to underſtand the comma, referring the word לו not to Aaron, but to החשן.

Ver. 6. *The badge of holineſs*; or, perhaps better, *conſecration.* נזר הקדש. I render נזר by the word *badge*, as moſt analogous to the radical meaning of the word, which denotes a pecu-

* With which he is to bring wine and water for the purpoſe of conſecration. † For waſhing and wiping the celebrant's fingers after the oblations. ‡ *Filling hands*, in the church of England's ritual, is more ſimple: A New Teſtament is delivered to a deacon, but a whole Bible to a prieſt and biſhop.

liar dedication of one's ſelf to any particular office. The Septuagint here uſe the ſame word as for ציץ in the laſt chapter, πεταλον, and Jerom *laminam:* the reſt a *crown*, or *diadem*, except Symmachus, who has αφορισμα, which favours my verſion.

Ver. 13. *The excreſcence of the liver.* היתרת על הכבד. Sep. τον λοβον του ηπατος—Vulg. *reticulum jecoris*; and ſo equivalently Onk. and Syr.: but both Arabs have very properly זיאדה, *ſuperfluity*; and Gr. Ven. το περιτ∫ον. I have, with them, preferred a general term to an uncertain particular one. My deceaſed friend Mr. S. Street thought it might be the gall-bladder. The greater number of modern interpreters take it to be the greater lobe of the liver, together with the gall-bladder.

Ver. 18. *It is a ſweet-ſavoured holocauſt to the Lord.* The text is: עלה הוא ליהוה ריח ניחוח אשה *ליהוה הוא, by Montanus rendered *Holocauſtum hoc Domino, odor quietis; ignitio Domino ipſa:* and our common verſion, "It *is* a burnt-offering unto the Lord: it *is* a ſweet ſavour, an offering made by fire unto the Lord." But there is no need of this tautology to expreſs the full force of the original, as the words עלה in the firſt comma, and אשה in the laſt, are both ſufficiently expreſſed by *holocauſt.*

Ver. 22. *The fat large tail.* האליה. There is nothing for this in the common copies of Sep. †; but the Roman ſcholiaſt ſays: "Alius interpres addit ex Hebræo και την κερκον." Vulg. *caudam.*—There is no doubt of its being the great fat tail of the Syrian and Arabian ſheep, which ſometimes weighs twenty pounds. See Shaw's *Travels*, Ruſſel's *Hiſt. of Aleppo*, or Harmer's *Obſervations*, vol. iv. p. 164.

Ver. 27. *The ſhoulder that hath been heaved as an heave-offering.* שוק התרומה אשר הרום. Sep. τον βραχιονα του αφαιρεματος ὁς αφωριςαι. Vulg. *armum quem* de ariete *ſeparaſti.* More properly Saadias: סאק אלרפיעה אלדי רפעת, *the ſhoulder of elevation which thou haſt elevated:* and ſo, in a ſomewhat different form, Arab. Erp.

Ver. 30. Our common verſion here makes אשר an adverb; and renders "when he cometh "into the tabernacle;" but againſt all the antients: even Gr. Ven. has ὁς ελευσεται; and indeed the ſenſe requires it. Delgado's correction is therefore juſt: "And he of his ſons that "ſhall be prieſt in his ſtead, who goes into the tabernacle to miniſter in the holy place, ſhall "put them on ſeven days ‡." This is evidently the meaning of the text; but this is not the only place of a thouſand where the common verſion, by ſticking too cloſely to the arrangement of the Hebrew words, is embarraſſed and faulty.

Ver. 32 and 33. The Sam. copy divides after the firſt אתם, and reads יאכלו § without the copulative, which was not read by Sep. Vulg. Syr. and which I believe to be the genuine lection. This diviſion is preferable, followed by Jerom. *Panes quoque, qui ſunt in caniſtro, in veſtibulo tabernaculi commedent.* And the Septuagint ſhould, in my opinion, be divided in the ſame manner, beginning verſe 32, with the editions of Francfort and Venice, at Και τους αρτους, or making ver. 32 and 33 but one, and placing the colon after αυτα, thus: Και εδονται Ααρων και οἱ υἱοι αυτου τα κρεα τϐ κριϐ, και τους αρτους τϐς εν τῳ κανῳ: παρα τας θυρας της

* The Sam. copy has הוא before ליהוה. † Elſewhere they render it οσφυν. ‡ The verſe is alſo well tranſlated by Bate. I wonder that Dathe and Michaëlis tranſlate otherwiſe, when Le Clerc and Houbigant had ſet them a better example. § For ſuch is the reading of 4 MSS. The printed Text has יאכל.

σκηνης

σκηνης του μαρτυριου εδονται αυτα, εν οις ἡγιασθησαν, κ. τ. λ. Or ver. 33 may begin with Παρα τας θυρας; which is the diviſion I have followed in my verſion.

Ver. 36. *Thou ſhalt ſacrifice.* Lit. *Thou ſhalt do.* So in Latin, *Cum faciam vitulo.* Virgil. —In this verſe again our common tranſlation is erroneous: חטאת על המזבח cannot ſignify "thou ſhalt cleanſe the altar;" although the Septuagint even give it that meaning: Και καθαριεις το θυσιαςηριον—and Vulg. *Mundabiſque altare.* Much better here Gr. Ven. Και ἁμαρτιωσεις επι τȣ θυτηριου. Delgado ſaw this, and properly corrected the Engliſh verſion: "Thou ſhalt "offer it for a ſin-offering UPON the altar." The prepoſition על excludes the other ſignification. See Houbigant; who, nevertheleſs, in my apprehenſion, has not hit upon the true meaning. His verſion is, *et quoniam macula erit in altari, dum tu expiabis eum* [Aaronem,] *altare inunges*, &c.—I believe I have rightly rendered; yet Le Clerc, Dathe and Michaëlis follow Luther, and the earlieſt modern interpreters. Bate is an exception, whoſe verſion is: "and thou ſhalt burn it upon the altar;" explained in his note thus: "Heb. *thou ſhalt ſin* "*it upon the altar*; i. e. do with it what was done to the ſin-offering."

Ver. 43. *And by my glory ſhall* the place *be ſanctified.* Delgado blames our tranſlators for ſupplying here the word "tabernacle," and thinks that the antecedent to נקדש is ישראל, *Iſrael**. This idea is favoured by the reading of Sam. נקדשו; but 4 Sam. MSS. read with Heb. and ſo read Jerom, both Arabs, Perſ. and Gr. Ven. But Sep. Syr. Onk. Tharg. ſeem to have read נקדשתי, *I will be ſanctified.* In my verſion I adhere to the common reading, and make *place* the ſupplied antecedent, with the Engliſh of Geneva, Bruccioli, the Tigurines, &c.

CHAP. XXX.

SEE the remarks of the firſt ten verſes of this chapter, after the 18th verſe of chap. 25, p. 267.

Ver. 18. *With its cover.* וכנו. Which our tranſlators render *and his foot*, or *ſtand*, or *baſe*, after Sep. and all the antient, and moſt modern, interpreters, in the ſuppoſition that the word is derived from כון. But it may come from כנן; and, although I conſider not the *dageſhed nun* as an indiſputable proof, it is ſufficient to make one doubt at leaſt, as it tells us that the punctator, whoever he was, conſidered the word as coming from what is called a *geminated* root. As כנן then, in Arab. ſignifies to *cover*, it is very probable that כן here denotes *a cover*. This derivation was firſt thought of by Louis de Dieu, and has been adopted by Clemens †, Dathe, Schulze, Roſenmüller. And, indeed, we might expect to find a *cover* for the *laver* mentioned among the utenſils of the tabernacle. As the laver ſtood in the open court, the water would ſoon be liable to be ſullied without ſuch a cover ‡.

Ver. 19.

* So Luther, Junius, the reviſed verſion of Geneva, Le Cene, Dathe, and others. Bate, after Jerom, makes it the *altar*. Caſtalio, Le Clerc, Michaëlis, ſupply *tabernacle*. Houbigant, with our Coverdale, follows the reading of Sep. † In his *Diſſertatio de labro æneo*, printed at Groeningen in 1732. ‡ "Uſus quidem, cui hoc la-"brum deſtinatum fuit, neceſſarium fecit, ut operculo eſſet obtectum. Nam quis non intelligit, aquam facile potuiſſe "inquinari, cum vas ſub dio, non in loco tecto eſſet collocatum? Deinde Moſes, quoties hujus labri mentionem injicit, "imprimis

Ver. 19. *And by it thou ſhalt place water.* ונתת שמה מים. Rendered by our tranſlators: "And thou ſhalt put water therein." And ſo Sep.: Και εχχεεις εις αυτον υδωρ; and equivalently Jerom: *Et miſsâ aquâ.* I follow the Sam. reading, שם *, which was that of Onk. Syr. Tharg. Perſ. Arab. Erp. and even of Gr. Ven. δωσεις τ' εκει υδωρ. The water was laid beſide the laver, to be uſed when neceſſary.

Ver. 23. *Five hundred parts.* In the original there is only *five hundred,* חמש מאות; and it is diſputed what word ought to be ſupplied. Some are for *ſhekels,* as Sep. Vulg. Onk. Tharg. Saad.; but Syr. Erp. and Gr. Ven. ſupply no word. The moderns have generally ſupplied *ſhekels*; ſome few, *gheras.* I have rather choſen to ſay proportional *parts,* as in medical recipés: *Take five* PARTS of ſuch and ſuch things each, *ana.* If all the parts here mentioned had weighed a *ſhekel,* an *hin* of oil would not have been ſufficient to give them the neceſſary liquidity; unleſs, with Michaëlis, we reduce the *ſhekel* of Moſes to one *fourth* or fifth part of latter *ſhekels.*

Ver. 33. *Or applieth it to a profane uſe.* ויתן ממנו על זר. Sep. Και ὁς αν δω απ' αυτου αλλογενει. Vulg. *Et dederit ex eo alieno*; and ſo nearly all the verſions. But the word αλλογενης, *alienus, ſtranger,* expreſſes not here the meaning of זר, which denotes every one, even an Iſraelite, not of the ſacerdotal order. Hence Michaëlis paraphraſes: "Wer ein gleiches oel "nachmacht, oder einen, *der nicht prieſter iſt,* damit ſalvet, &c." I have given the comma another turn, which fully expreſſes the meaning.

Ver. 34. *Bdellium.* שחלת. By our tranſlators rendered "onycha," from the ονυχα of Sep. and *onycha* of Jerom. This is an odoriferous ſhell, called in German *ſee-nagel,* by us *nail-fiſh,* and by the French *ongle odorant.* In the ſhops it is called *blatta Byſantina,* and moſt interpreters think that it is the ſame with the Hebrew שחלת. I cannot, however, think that any *ſhell* is here meant. In Syr. שחל is to *drop,* to *diſtil*; and שחלתא is a *tear, diſtillation.* I ſuſpect then that the Heb. שחלת is ſome reſinous ſubſtance, and as likely to be the *bdellium* as any other. It is here claſſed with other vegetable ſubſtances, with which it is not probable the nail-fiſh ſhell would be mingled. Rumphius's objection, that the bdellium was not uſed by the antients as an unguent, is of little force. It is not here uſed as an unguent, but as part of a perfume; and although it be not itſelf very odoriferous, it might be uſeful on another account, namely, to make the whole compound more inflammable. It is remarkable, that both Arabs have here לדנא, *ladanum*; viciouſly written *labdanum.* See C. R. on Gen. 37. 25.

Ver. 35. *A compoſition pure and ſacred.* ממלח טהור קדש. By Arias Montanus rendered *ſalitum mundum ſanctitas:* and ſome modern interpreters, among whom Michaëlis, think that ממלח here implies the addition of a ſort of *ſalt,* namely *nitre,* or *ſaltpetre*; which, mingled with the other ingredients, gave a ſtronger and more extenſive flavour to them. So Dathe:

"imprimis in initiatione ejus et conſecratione, ſemper et *rov* כן meminit. Jam vero non apparet, cur hoc fecerit, ſi כן "*baſin* vel *ſcapum* notat, unamque cum labro partem effecerit. Quod ſi ſeparata et diſtincta ejus pars fuit, utique "neceſſe erat, ut utriuſque faceret mentionem." Dathe in loc.—Although I think not this reaſoning altogether concluſive, it is ſo ſpecious, that I have been led by it in my tranſlation. Michaëlis, however, and Hezel keep firm to the antient *baſe*; and I am not ſure but they have reaſon. * Even שמה admits the ſame meaning; nay, hardly admits any other, in ſuch a poſition as the preſent.

adhibito

adhibito ſale puro et ſancto. But there is no veſtige of this additional ſalt in the antient verſions; and, indeed, the conſtruction will not admit of it. The moſt that can be inferred from the etymon of מלח is, that the compoſition was made up, or granulated, in the manner of ſalt. The Sam. reading ממחלת, correſponding with the preceding קטרת, is in favour of this idea.

CHAP. XXXI.

Ver. 6. *AND in the mind of every* other *intelligent man have I put wiſdom.* ובלב כל חכם לב נתתי חכמה. Lit. "And in the mind (or heart) of every wiſe-minded man I have put "wiſdom." An apparent tautology; but which is read in all the copies without any variety, ſave that 2 MSS. want לב after חכם; and ſuch perhaps was the reading which Jerom and Saadias had before them. I ſay perhaps, becauſe both are wont to ſuppreſs pleonaſms; and in many caſes are unſure guides to lead us to the original reading. All the other ant. verſions, down to Gr. Ven. read לב. Yet certainly the phraſe is pleonaſtic, to ſay no more. Mr. Dimock would read ובלבם כל חכמה נתתי, *and in their minds I have put all wiſdom.* But this, to me, appears too licentious an alteration, unſupported by any authority.—Houbigant has ſoftened the tautology thus: *et omnibus, qui ingenio præditi ſunt, dedi prudentiam:* and Dathe: *atque reliquis quoque artificibus peritiam contuli.*—The meaning of the Text, which I would leave entire, ſeems to be: "In the mind of every man, who is already wiſe, I will put "more wiſdom;" that is, will increaſe his natural ingenuity and ſkill, to deviſe and execute whatever is neceſſary. Moſes choſe among his people thoſe whom he knew to be the beſt artificers, or perhaps thoſe whom he favoured moſt; for, if Joſephus may be believed, Bezaleel was either the ſon or grandſon of Mary, the ſiſter of Moſes. The ſame Joſephus ſays, that although Bezaleel, and his aſſociates, were appointed artificers of the tabernacle, &c by God, they were ſuch men as the people, if left to themſelves, would have ſelected for that purpoſe: ους και το πληθος αν επελεξατο, της εξουσιας επ' αυτῳ γενομενης *.—Again he ſays, that Bezaleel and Eliab were deemed to be the chief artificers, inaſmuch as they improved former inventions, and by the dint of their own genius invented things that were before unknown: Των γαρ ενευρημενων τοις προτεροις αυτοι προεθυμηθησαν αμεινονα προσεργασασθαι, λαβειν τε επινοιαν ὡν προτερον ηγνοουν την κατασκευην ικανωτατοι †. In every language in the world, God is ſaid to *give* thoſe talents and endowments, whether natural or acquired, that diſtinguiſh one man from another; but in the eaſtern ſtyle, this language is bolder and more metaphorical than in our occidental regions.

Ver. 10. *The ſervice-cloths for the ſervice of the ſanctuary.* The preſent Heb. text has only את בגדי השרד, rendered by Montanus *veſtes miniſterii,* and in our vulgar verſion *the cloths of ſervice*; as if השרד were the ſame with השרת, which is here the reading of Sam. ‡—Which then is the true reading? and, if it be השרד, what is its meaning?—The antient verſions

* Ant. l. 3. c. 6. n. 1. † Ibid. c. 8. n. 4. ‡ But 8 Sam. MSS. have השרד; which is the textual reading in the other three parallel places, ch. 35. 19. and 39. 1 and 41.

throw

throw little light on the ſubject. The Septuagint omit the words entirely *, and ſeem not to have read the words in their copy any more than Jerom.—Syr. Onk. Tharg. Sam. verſion, Arab. Erp. Perſ. and Gr. Ven. have *cloths of ſervice*; conſequently they read השרת, or gave to השרד the ſame meaning.—Saadias certainly read השרד; and, I think, has well rendered it תיאב אלושי: for, in the Sam. dialect, שרדה ſignifies *a variegated garment*; in Chald. סרדין are *embroidered*, or *craticulated*, *cloths*; and the radical meaning of סרד in Arab. is to *ſew*, *weave*, and the like. This then is certainly a plauſible interpretation; yet I am more inclined to think השרת the better reading, and have followed it in my verſion. For the reſt, I am perſuaded that two words have been dropped out of the text; namely, לשרת בקדש; which are in all the parallel places, and here in 7 Heb. MSS. and in 4 copies of Chald. See De Roſſi.—On this authority I have inſerted them in my Tranſlation. In my Explanatory Note, I have, perhaps, expreſſed myſelf too definitely with reſpect to the *cloths of ſervice* here mentioned. It may be, that not only the wrappers, but the curtains, veils, and all cloths belonging to the tabernacle, are included in בגדי השרת.

Ver. 18. *Written with his own finger.* I ſhall here content myſelf with preſenting to my readers Roſenmüller's *ſcholium* on this paſſage. "Non videntur hæc verba ad litteram eſſe "intelligenda, ſed hoc tantum ſignificare, *Deum dictitaſſe Moſi iſtum legum complexum*; ſive, "*Deum in mandatis dediſſe* Moſi, *ut leges duabus tabulis inſcriberet.* Moſes illa locutione ſine "dubio ideo uſus eſt, ut indicaret illarum legum ſanctitatem, atque ut adaugeret Iſraelitarum "in illas reverentiam. Alii putant, ut Vogel ad Grotium hoc loco, Moſen hac locutione "uſum eſſe, non ut perſuaderet populo, a Deo eſſe inſcriptas has tabulas, ſed ut accommo-"daret ſeſe ad opinionem populi: qui, videns eum tabulas illas e Monte Sinai apportantem, "credidiſſet, eas non arte humana, ſed ab ipſo Deo eſſe fabricatas atque inſcriptas."—We afterwards learn that theſe ſame tables, written on by the finger of God, were broken by Moſes himſelf, when he came down from Mount Sinai, and were never more heard of. Surely the ſmalleſt fragment of them was as worthy of being preſerved in the ark as the urn of manna, or Aaron's rod. A ſingle word, or letter, written by the hand of God, and on tables wrought by the hand of God, would have been the moſt rare and precious of all ſacred things. Of the ſecond tables, the writing only was God's; the workmanſhip Moſes's.

CHAP. XXXII.

Ver. 4. *IN a mould.* בחרט. Variouſly rendered by the antients. Sep. and Gr. Ven. *εν τῃ γραφιδι.* Vulg. *opere fuſorio.* Syr. בתופסא, *in a model.* Sam. Verſ. במרכי; by Caſtell rendered *ſtylo*, but which I believe to have the ſame meaning as Syr. See the Chald. root מרך. Onk. בזיפא, which, whether well rendered by Buxtorf *in ſtylo*, I doubt. Tharg. בטופרא, not leſs ambiguous than the former. Saad. בקאלב; and Erp. פי אלקאלב; both denoting a *model* or *frame*. Perſ. در بوتة, *in a crucible*, or *melting-pot*: a moſt apt verſion, if חרט could bear ſuch a meaning. As the word occurs, in any form, but four times in the whole Bible, its

* I once ſuſpected that they had deſignedly omitted them, or that their text wanted the copulative before the ſecond את; which is the reading of 2 Sam. MSS. In this ſuppoſition they omit nothing, but only ſuppreſs the pleonaſtic את בגדי. The ſame may be ſaid of Jerom's verſion.

meaning

meaning is not eaſily determined. In Iſaiah, 8. 1. its ſignification is in ſome meaſure fixed by the context; yet not ſo preciſely as to exclude all doubt. In Sep. it is rendered γραφιδι; by Jerom *ſtylo*; and by our Engliſh tranſlators a *pen* *. But it is my opinion that none of theſe terms denote the meaning of the original. The Syr. tranſlator ſeems to have happily rendered it בכתבא דאנשא, very properly tranſlated *humano ſcribendi more*. "Take a book," ſays he, "and write in it *in common writing*." This I take to be the real meaning of the word in Iſaiah. It does not then denote the inſtrument uſed in writing, but the *form* or *character* of the writing; and in this ſenſe we ſhall ſee how it comes in to ſupport the meaning which I have given to the word in Exodus. In Iſaiah, 3. 22. חרטים is, in our common verſion, rendered *criſping-pins*; by Purver *pockets*; and by Lowth and Dodſon *little purſes*. In 2 K. 5. 23. the ſame word is, in our common verſion, rendered *bags*; but by Bate *caſes*, which I take to be the better rendering. Jerom, indeed, has *faccis*; and Tharg. and Syr. have terms equivalent; but Greek and Arab. have θυλακοις, and תליסין, *baſkets*; and theſe were certainly more proper for carrying two talents of ſilver (169,724 pounds), than two bags of any ſort. May not the חרטים of Iſaiah, 3. 22. be ſomething of the ſame kind—a work-baſket for example; or a baſket to hold trinkets?—In any caſe, we may infer from theſe places that חרט was not a *ſtyle*, but ſome veſſel of capacity, fit for the reception of ſomething elſe. If we apply this to the paſſage of Exodus, it will appear, I think, that חרט muſt mean either the veſſel in which the gold was melted, or the mould in which it was faſhioned. I have preferred the latter meaning for the following reaſons. Firſt, It was ſo underſtood by Syr. and both Arabs, between whom there could be no colluſion. Secondly, In the Sam. dialect, חרטה ſignifies a *form, model*: "God created all things without a model, בלי חרטה." Thirdly, the common rendering, *a graving-tool*, is inept; for, how could he faſhion the gold with a graving-tool before it was fuſed?—Hence Le Clerc and Dathe, who retain the term, are obliged to uſe a hyſteron-proteron to make ſenſe of the paſſage: *et formavit illud cælo, poſtquam vitulum fuſum ex eo fecerat*. Somewhat better Michaëlis: "machte mit dem griffel eine "zeichnung," *he made a model with a graving-tool* or *ſtyle* †. But in the text is either no *ſtyle* or no *model*: *model*, then, appears to be the more eligible term. I cannot, however, but confeſs, that the Perſic verſion is very plauſible: *he put it into the crucible*: agreeably to what Aaron himſelf ſays, ver. 24, in his own excuſe: "I threw them into the fire, and out came "that calf."—This is expreſsly againſt the interpretation of Hezel, adopted by Roſenmüller, who imagined that the calf was made of wood, and only covered over with gold ‡.—They were, probably, led to this explanation here, from the difficulty of explaining ver. 20.

Ver. 5. *When Aaron ſaw* this. וירא אהרון. The Syrian tranſlator ſeems to have read ויירא: "And Aaron was afraid:" which Houbigant prefers to the preſent reading. This might, in-

* Very improperly, for pens were not then uſed in writing; nor are they uſed at this day in thoſe countries, reeds ſupply their place; but in the days of Iſaiah, the implement of writing was a *ſtylus*, or *pin*. † So in his German Verſion: but he afterwards was inclined to think that *frame*, or *model*, was the proper rendering of חרש.

‡ "Er bildete (ſchnitzte) es (das götzenbild) mit einem meiſſel, und er machte es (nemlich das, was er bereits aus "holz geſchnitzt hatte) zu einim kalb (ſtier) des gieſſens.—Er überzog das aus holz geſchnitzte götzenbild mit einem "guſs von gold."

deed, ſerve in ſome ſort to alleviate the criminal condeſcenſion of Aaron; but as all the other interpreters read ירא, and as there is no variety of lection in the copies of either the Heb. or Sam. text, I ſee no reaſon for departing from the preſent reading. Houbigant's objection, "cum præſertim non addatur quid videat Aaron," is of no force, as it is not uncommon to find the verb ראה without its objective caſe.

Ver. 8. *Which thou commandedſt them.* אשר צויתם. The Maſoretes have pointed צויתם, as if it were in the 1 p. ſing.; and 18 mss. with the ant. edition of Soncino, have צויתים full *: yet I am perſuaded that we ought to read in the ſecond perſon, becauſe that is the uniform reading of all the copies of Sam. in which the diſtinguiſhing *jod* is never ſuppreſſed—becauſe the Sam. verſion follows that reading—becauſe it was the reading of Sep. and Vulg. and perhaps that of Syr. and Onk.—and becauſe it better accords with the context, *Thou haſt brought—thou haſt commanded.*

Ver. 19. *So hot was his anger,* &c. It is not eaſy to account for this conduct of Moſes, who is elſewhere declared to be the mildeſt of men. If the tables which he had in his hands were really the workmanſhip of God, and written on by the finger of God, as is expreſsly ſaid ver. 16. we can hardly conceive how any provocation, on the part of the people, could induce him to break in pieces ſo rare a monument and ſo ſacred a truſt. We are told by interpreters, that it was the ſudden effect of a warm, pious, holy zeal. That it was warm, it muſt be allowed; but how it could be pious or holy, one is at a loſs to perceive. I mean, ſtill, in the ſuppoſition that the tables were the manufacture of God. We muſt, then, either confeſs that Moſes here, with all his mildneſs, piety, and zeal, committed a raſh and unwarrantable action, or allow that neither the tables nor the writing on them were literally the handy-work of God. This is, indeed, what our more modern commentators ſeem willing to grant. So Roſenmüller, after thus rendering the words of the text: *Et tabulæ erant opus Dei, et ſcriptura erat ſcriptura Dei, inſculpta tabulis,*" adds: "Quorum verborum ſenſus videtur eſſe "hic: tam tabulas ipſas earumque formam, quam earum inſcribendarum rationem, proveniſſe "ex divina inſtitutione, qua uſus fuit Moſes."

Ver. 20. It is aſked how Moſes could beat gold to a powder; and various anſwers have been given. There are who think that it was done by ſome chymical operation, known in thoſe days, but loſt afterwards. We know that gold is diſſolved in *aqua-regis*; and that the ſolution, precipitated by volatile alkali, produces a gold duſt, *aurum fulminans*; but whether this proceſs were known to Moſes, or to the Hebrews of any other period, it is at leaſt very doubtful. Aben Ezrah indeed tells us, as a thing unqueſtionable, that gold may be turned into powder by a mixture of certain herbs; and that after the operation it is not reconvertible into gold: and Emanuel Sa profeſſes to have ſeen an alchymiſt of his day reduce gold into duſt: but both theſe teſtimonies have been ſtrongly ſuſpected; and in the latter caſe, perhaps, the alchymiſt impoſed on the jeſuit. Michaëlis and other modern critics imagined that the calf was made of gilt wood, and conſequently might eaſily be burnt to aſhes: but this, to me, appears totally repugnant to the text of Scripture, as has been already obſerved.

* The words in both, when unpointed, are ambiguous; but De Roſſi found 16 Chald. mss. and 10 printed editions, which had מקדתינון in the firſt perſon: and ſo read both Arabs, Perſ. and Gr. Ven. The reader will balance the authorities, and judge for himſelf, as I have done.

I am,

I am, therefore, inclined to think, with Syr. Onk. and both Arabs, that the maſs of gold was filed down by a file, or ſome ſuch inſtrument.—Joſephus ſays, that Solomon's horſemen, among other ſplendid decorations, had their fine long hair daily powdered with ſuch filings *. Of this indeed there is no mention in the preſent Hebrew volumes; but as they tell us that gold was uncommonly plenteous in the days of Solomon, it is nowiſe improbable that his cavalry might uſe its filings for the decoration of their perſons. At any rate, Joſephus muſt have alluded to ſome ſuch oriental cuſtom.

Ver. 25. *When Moſes ſaw that the people were in diſarray.* The Hebrew word פרוע is commonly rendered *naked* †; and ſome word is ſuppoſed to be underſtood, ſuch as *ear-rings—arms—the grace of God*, &c. But there is no need of any ſupplement; the meaning of פרוע is clear from the context, and from other paſſages of Scripture, and it is well rendered by Sep. διεσκεδασαι ‡. The people were in a *diſſipated, diſſolute, diſorderly* ſtate; and therefore in a condition to be attacked with advantage; for the words, which in our common verſion are rendered "unto their ſhame among their enemies," לשמצה בקמיהם, or, as much better the Sam. copy, לשמצו בקומיהם, are, in my opinion, groſsly miſtranſlated. The word שמץ occurs but here and in Job, 4. 12. where it has been generally rendered *a little, pauxillum*; but which, I am perſuaded, is not its meaning §. I am perſuaded, with Houbigant, Michaëlis, and Dathe, that we are to look for the radical ſignification of the word in the Arabic שמץ, *to ſmite ſuddenly*; the ſame with the Heb. שמד, from which our *ſmite* || may be derived, as the German *ſchmeiſſen* from שמץ. The Greek tranſlators ſeem to have read לשמחה, as they render επιχαρμα ¶ τοις υπεναντιοις αυτων, *to the joy*, or *deriſion, of their adverſaries*: yet they may have read as we do, and gueſſed the beſt they could at the meaning of an uncommon word. In fact, their verſion is eſſentially the ſame with that which I have adopted; for a people that *may be eaſily ſmitten* by the aſſailants, muſt be an object of *joy*, or *deriſion*, to theſe aſſailants. I will now give Michaëlis's verſion of the whole verſe: "Moſe ſahe nun das volk vom geſetz "losgeriſſen (denn Aharon ſelbſt hatte ſie losgemacht), und daſs ſie vor jedem, der wider eis "aufſtünde, würden fliehen müſſen."—Dathe: *Cum autem Moſes populum paſſim diſſolutum videret, quia juſſu Aaronis feſtum celebrabat, et facilè cædi poſſe, ſi quis eum aggrederetur.*—The firſt and laſt commas are rightly and elegantly rendered; but the ſecond is an unneceſſary paraphraſe.

Ver. 29. *And Moſes ſaid, To-day ye have initiated yourſelves*, &c. Lit. *To-day your hands have been filled.*—The conſtruction of this verſe makes it ambiguous. The word מלאו may be either the ſecond perſon pl. imperative, or the third perſon pl. of the præterite of both the active and paſſive voices. The Maſoretes have pointed it in the firſt acceptation, and have been followed by moſt moderns, who, to reconcile the text with itſelf, put the preceding אמר in the pluperfect tenſe. So our Engliſh Verſion: "For Moſes had ſaid, Conſecrate yourſelves "to-day to the Lord, &c." And Delgado thinks it neceſſary, moreover, to put the 8th verſe in a parentheſis, as an interruption in the ſpeech of Moſes. But certainly all this is

* Ψηγμα δε χρυσου (al. χρυσιου) καθ' ἡμεραν αυτων επεσηθον ταις κομαις. Ant. l. viii. c. 7. n. 3. p. 448.

† From the Vulg. *nudatus*. ‡ So alſo Theod.: ὁτι διασκεδασμενος εστιν. § See the Rem. on that place. || Sax. *ſmitan*; Belg. *ſmyten*; from the ſame root is our *ſmith*, the German *ſchmid*, and the Belgic *ſmid*. ¶ Or perhaps επι χαρμα in two words.

very awkward, and is eaſily amended by making מלאו the pret. of *Niphal*, and ידיכם * its nominative: *Et dixit Moſes: Impletæ ſunt manus veſtræ hodie.*—At firſt ſight, one would be apt to think that the Septuagint and Jerom read in their copies מלאתם, as they render *επληρωσατε τας χειρας υμων, conſecraſtis manus veſtras:* but I believe they read as the preſent text, conſidered מלאו as a paſſive, but gave another turn to the ſentence, without in the ſmalleſt degree changing its meaning; for, *ye have filled* or *conſecrated your hands*, and *your hands have been filled* or *conſecrated*, are perfectly homologous.

Ver. 32. "Our tranſlation," ſays Secker, "as it is pointed, doth not anſwer the Hebrew; "and if the comma after *wilt* be omitted, the ſenſe is imperfect. Sam. and Sep. add אם; "but an ellipſis is uſual in this form of ſpeech. See 1 Sam. 12. 14; Luke, 13. 9."—He thinks the verſe might be tranſlated thus: "Wilt thou now forgive their ſins? If not, &c." A very ingenious emendation; but as אם is in the Sam. text, and as the Septuagint either read it in their copy, or ſupplied it, I ſee no reaſon why we ſhould not follow them. Jerom ſupplies the omiſſion thus: "Aut demitte eis hanc noxam; aut, ſi non *facis*, dele, &c." Dathe: "Quod ſi ei condonaveris, *felicem me exiſtimabo*; ſin minus, dele me e catalogo *viventium*."

CHAP. XXXIII.

Ver. 7. *MOSES took his tent.* In the text there is only האהל, *the tent*; but Sep. and Syr. ſeem to have read האהלו, *his own tent*; and this reading I have followed in my Verſion. Some commentators, however, think that, even before the conſtruction of the Tabernacle, the Iſraelites had a public tent, dedicated to religion, which tent is here to be underſtood. But if this were the caſe, it is odd that no mention of it is ever made before.—Perhaps we might render *a tent*, as it is certain that the prefix ה is not always a definitive article: yet ſtill I think it more probable that it was the ſpecial tent of Moſes †.

Ver. 11. *Now the Lord talked with Moſes, as a man talketh with his friend.* From this and other expreſſions, in the following verſes, the reader may form a tolerable idea of the extravagance of oriental hyperbolé; and if he underſtand German, he will find in Herder's *Spirit of Hebrew Poeſy* a beautiful illuſtration of this whole chapter.

Ver. 12. *I know thee by name.* ידעתיך בשם. Well rendered by Sep. *οιδα σε παρα παντας, I know thee above all others*; i. e. Thou art a diſtinguiſhed favourite ‡.

Ver. 13. *Make known to me thy purpoſes.* The preſent Heb. text has הודיעני את דרכך *ſhew me thy way*; but I believe the true reading to be דרכיך, which is that of Sam. and above 20 MSS. and of Saadias and the Perſic tranſlator; and I take the meaning of דרכי here to be *purpoſes, deſigns, ways* of *acting*. The Septuagint have *εφανισον μοι σεαυτον*; and Vulg. *oſtende*

* Which is the reading of Sam. 13 MSS. Sep. Syr. Vulg. and one of De Roſſi's Chald. MSS. † Michaëlis argues thus. In ver. 8. it is ſaid that Moſes went out of the camp to the tent in queſtion; therefore his tent muſt ſtill have been in the camp. But this by no means follows: he returned from his own tent from time to time, to impart to the people the divine injunctions; but it is nowhere ſaid that he remained in the camp any longer than his commiſſions were delivered. ‡ "Locutio ſumpta a principibus, qui non omnes ſuos cives, ſed paucos duntaxat norunt, "qui ad interiorem familiaritatem admitti, et apud eos gratioſi eſſe ſolent." Roſenmüller in loc.

mihi

mihi faciem tuam: yet it is probable that they had not different readings before them, but only metaphraſed.

Ver. 18. *Shew me then thy glory.* הראני נא את כבדך. Michaëlis is of opinion that כבד here means the *heart*, as it does in the Arabic, and that *heart* is equivalent to *ſelf*, as if Moſes ſaid: "Shew me thy very ſelf, thine own eſſence." So, indeed, the Septuagint have here rendered εφανισον μοι σεαυτον, the ſame words which they had before employed in ver. 13*. I prefer the common meaning of כבד, with all the other ant. tranſlators, down to Gr. Ven. which has literally, yet elegantly, δειξον μοι δη την δοξαν σου.

I cannot quit this chapter without inſerting here the ſubſtance of ſome obſervations made on it by Delgado. He finds the explication of the chapter a very difficult taſk: "Firſt, on "account of the myſterious ſubject thereof;" which he paſſes over "as almoſt unintelligible." .... "The ſecond difficulty conſiſts in the tranſpoſition of ſentences, which makes this "chapter almoſt unintelligible, in point of ſucceſſion of events; for the firſt three verſes God "ſpoke to Moſes while he was on the mountain: then Scripture interrupts the narrative, "ver. 4, to inform us what the people did in conſequence of what God told him in ver. 5, "in which a reaſon is aſſigned for their behaviour in ver. 4, as if he had been down from the "mountain to tell it them. Ver. 6 follows cloſe to ver. 4; and what is narrated in ver. 7, to "the end of ver. 11, muſt refer to what happened after Moſes came down the laſt time. In "ver. 12, the dialogue between God and Moſes is reſumed; and Moſes gives an anſwer to "God's laſt ſpeech in ver. 2 and ver. 5; and the diſcourſe is carried on to the 3d verſe in "the following chapter; ſo that the tranſitions are numerous and perplexed."—Theſe are the reflections of a learned Jew upon his own Scriptures; but I apprehend they are in a great meaſure founded on a miſtake, namely, that Moſes was on Mount Sinai when God ſpoke to him in ver. 1, or indeed in any other part of this chapter. Verſes 8—11 are indeed a ſort of interruption of the narrative: but ſuch interruptions are very frequent in the Hebrew Scriptures. The hiſtorian having once mentioned the council-tent, very naturally adds what is contained in the foreſaid verſes before he proceeds. I truſt that the tranſpoſitions complained of by Delgado diſappear in my Verſion.

CHAP. XXXIV.

Ver. 7. *ACQUITTING even him who is not innocent.* ונקה לא ינקה; by Montanus rendered *purificando non purificabit*; and by our laſt Engliſh tranſlators, "And that will by no means "clear *the guilty* †." The Septuagint took it in the ſame ſenſe, και ου καθαριει τον ενοχον; and ſo equivalently Onk. Tharg. Erp. and Perſ.—The Syr. and Saad. may alſo be underſtood in

* From this it might be ſuſpected that they read כבוד in both places; but this is very uncertain. † Cov.: "Before whom there is no man innocent."—Mat.: "For there is no man innocent before thee;" after Vulg.—Biſh.: "And not leaving one innocent."—Gen.: "Not making *the wicked* innocent."—Bate: "But who will not wholly "clear."—Purver: "However not at all acquitting."—Delgado: "But will not totally clear the guilty."—More literally Ainſworth: "And that will not clearing clear *the guilty*."——Similar to one or other of theſe is every foreign verſion, whether Latin or vernacular. See Poole's Synopſis.

the

the ſame ſenſe. Gr. Ven. is ſingular: *και αθωος ουκ αθωωθησεται, and the innocent ſhall not be deemed innocent.* He underſtood the words in their proper ſenſe, but thought that נקה related to the *innocent* man, not to God. Nay, ſo ſeems Jerom to have done, who thus paraphraſes: *Nulluſque apud te per ſe innocens eſt:* an unwarrantable verſion on two accounts; firſt, becauſe it gives a falſe nominative to ינקה; and ſecondly, becauſe it puts the words in the mouth of Moſes, as is done throughout the whole verſe.—There is a various reading in the Sam. copy, which changes the meaning: it has לו inſtead of לא; and this forms a conſentaneous meaning: *And to*, or *with, him, the innocent will be accounted innocent.* Yet I am perſuaded it is not the genuine reading, and ſuſpect that an א has been dropped out of the Samaritan text, which had originally לוא written full. We muſt then be contented with the preſent reading, and try to make it congruous; for every verſion that I have ſeen is harſh, unanalogous, and diſcordant; that of De Dieu, adopted by Dathe and Roſenmüller, not excepted *. For, granting that נקה ſignifies *perdere*, which I very much queſtion †, where is there an example of its alſo ſignifying *impius* in any oriental dialect ‡?

I am ever loth to wreſt a word to a meaning which it ſeemingly cannot bear; and therefore I here take נקה in its common and well-known acceptation. Then, I think, it will be readily allowed, that נקה is in the ſame participial, or gerundive form, as נצר and נשא which precede, and פקד that follows; and that ינקה has a ſimilar ſignification. This being granted, I conſider the words נקה לא ינקה as equivalent to נקה אשר לא ינקה. Every novice in Hebrew grammar knows that אשר is often elegantly ſuppreſſed in ſimilar phraſes. I ſhall only quote a few from the Pſalms, in which this *ellipſis* is frequent. Pſalm 33. 12. העם בחר, *The people* whom *he choſe.* 91. 6. מחץ יעוף יומם, *From the arrow* which *flieth by day.* 118. 24. אבן מאסו הבונים, *The ſtone* which *the builders rejected.* And with the negative לא, as here, Pſalm 18. 44. עם לא ידעתי, *A people* whom *I knew not.* 52. 9. הגבר לא ישים, *The man* who *putteth not.* 81. 6. שפת לא ידעתי, *A tongue* which *I knew not.*—And, what is remarkable, our own language often admits a ſimilar mode of phraſing; as, in the laſt example, we might ſay, *He ſpoke a tongue I knew not: He is a man I never ſaw: It is a book I have not read:* and ſo with regard to the other perſonal pronouns, both ſingular and plural. This ellipſis being admitted, and the vowel-points changed, the literal verſion will be *mundans eum, qui non mundus eſt*; or, as I have rendered in my Verſion, *acquitting him* even *who is not* altogether *innocent.* If any one like not this verſion, let him chooſe or frame another for himſelf.

Ver. 21. *In ſeed-time even, and in harveſt, ſhalt thou reſt.*—Delgado would correct our common verſion thus; "From earing and from reaping thou ſhalt reſt;" with the following note; "It doth not refer to the ſeaſons; for if ſo, in fruit-time and in winter, we ſhould be

* "Plerique interpretes verba Textus vertere ſolent *non impunè demittet impium.* Rectè quidem quoad ſententiam, "atque etiam verbi נקה ſignificationem; ſed non ſatis aptè quoad contextum, aut reliqua Dei attributa hic laudata.... "Sed נקה etiam ſignificat *vaſtare, perdere*; quæ notio, miſericordiam Dei egregiè pingens, contextui aptiſſima videtur." Dathe; who renders *Non prorſus perdit impium,* and joins it to what follows. † The example quoted from Zachariah, 5. 3. is very doubtful, as I ſhall ſhew in my Rem. on that place; which the Syr. tranſlator, I think, has very properly rendered. ‡ It is well remarked by Secker that "נקה nowhere occurs as a noun; nor does נקי "or נקיא ever ſignify a perſon who deſerves to be puniſhed, and is not; but one who is free from guilt, or exempted "from puniſhment; or, as 1 K. 15. 26. *free from obligation.* See alſo Exod. 21. 19; Num. 5. 31; Deut. 5. 11; "Job, 9. 28."

"diſpenſed

" diſpenſed from keeping the ſabbath; which is abſurd: but it means, that in that day we " muſt refrain from thoſe labours, and ſuch like: an *et cætera* being meant, which is lacking " in the Hebrew, according to the Scripture ſtyle, though &c. is common in the Rabbi- " nical writings."—I cannot but wonder at this remark. The text is בחריש ובקציר תשבת; whereas, to have the meaning given to it by this tranſlator, it ſhould be מחריש and מקציר; as in Gen. 2. 3. שבת מכל מאכתו; and Exod. 5. 5. השבתם אתם מסבלתם. All the antient interpreters * concur in rendering the comma; but none has better expreſſed the ſenſe than Saadias: חתי תסבת פי וקת אלחרת אלחצאד, *keep the ſabbath even in the time of ploughing and of reaping*. The meaning of the precept evidently is, that the ſabbath ſhould be ſtrictly obſerved even in the buſieſt times of the year, the ſeed-time and the harveſt; which includes the vintage and fruit-gathering. Nor was this a hard injunction in Judæa, where the weather, during thoſe ſeaſons, is conſtantly fine and favourable. In other climates the obligation would often be attended with ſerious conſequences.

Ver. 23. *Three times in the year ſhall all your male children appear before the Lord.* As we are not told at what age the males were obliged to appear, we are at liberty to gueſs that it might be from the age of twenty years upwards; yet, even with this modification, to draw together, thrice every year, ſo many men from their domeſtic avocations, might ſeem to be no good political economy. Hence the late Mr. Street thought that the words might be thus rendered: " At three diſtinct ſeaſons may be ſeen all the males before the Lord;" ſo that but one-third of them, at a time, were called together: but I think the text will not bear this meaning. It is certain that very great multitudes may be aſſembled in thoſe countries, where travellers live on little, and bring along with them all that is neceſſary during their ſtay at the place of meeting, and for their journey to and from it. From Joſephus we learn, that not leſs than 1,100,000 men periſhed at the ſiege of Jeruſalem: and to obviate the objection, how could ſo many be aſſembled? he adds, that at a former paſchal ſolemnity, a cenſus had been made by the high-prieſts, at the deſire of the pro-conſul *Ceſtius*; and that the number of men preſent were 2,700,000, the unclean and ſtrangers not included †.—I am apt to think that the number is exaggerated; but were we to reduce it one-half, it would be ſtill a great number. But this was at a paſchal ſolemnity, the greateſt among the Hebrew people; and at that period the Jews ſeem to have been ſtricter obſervers of their ritual laws than their predeceſſors before the Captivity.—For the reſt, I find not a ſingle inſtance of the obſervation of this Moſaical precept, not even in the reign of the pious David, or of the wiſe Solomon: nor, indeed, do we read of the great *Phaſah* itſelf being kept but once by King Joſiah; 2 K. 23. 21. and 2 Chron. 35. 1.—It is true we may conclude from the context that it had been

* Sep. τῳ σπορῳ και τῳ αμητῳ—Vulg. *Die ſeptimo ceſſabis arare et metere*—Onk. בזורעא ובחצדא תנוח; and ſo equivalently Syr. Tharg. Erp. Perſ. and Gr. Ven.: εν αροτῳ κἀν αμητῳ αναπαυσεις. † Οτι δε εχωρει τοσουτος ἡ πολις, δηλον εκ των επι Κεστιου συναριθμηθεντων, ὁς .... παρεκαλεσε τους αρχιερεις, ειπως δυνατον ειη, τον πληθυν εξαριθμησασθαι· ὁι δε, ενς-ασης ἑορτης (Πασχα καλειται) καθ' ἡν θυουσι μεν απο εννατης ὡρας μεχρι ἑνδεκατης .... των μεν ουν θυματων εικοσι πεντε μυριαδας ηριθμησαν, προς δε ἑξακισχιλια και πεντακοσια· γινονται δ' ανδρων, ἱν' ἑκας-ος δεκα δαιτυμονας θωμεν, ΜΥΡΙΑΔΕΣ ΕΒΔΟΜΗΚΟΝΤΑ ΚΑΙ ΔΙΑΚΟΣΙΑΙ, καθαρων ἁπαντων και ἁγιων. De Bell. Jud. l. vi. c. 9. n. 3. p. 399.

obſerved

obſerved in prior times, although not with ſuch ſolemnity*; yet it is very odd that not one inſtance of it is recorded in the Hebrew annals, from the entrance of the Iſraelites into the land of Chanaan, ſave once by Joſhuah at Gilgal, after the paſſage of the Jordan. See Joſh. 5. 10.—Is it not ſtrange that Solomon, who offered ſo many thouſands of victims, is never ſaid to have kept either the paſchal feſtival, or any of the other two feſtivals here mentioned?

Ver. 28. *And he wrote upon the tables the words of the covenant, ten articles.* The original is: ויכתב לע הלחות את דברי הברית עשרות הדברים. The queſtion is, what is the nominative to יכתב? The context leads us to imagine that it was Moſes who wrote, as he is deſired to do in ver. 27.; in which caſe, the writing muſt be the precepts recorded from ver. 12 to 26 incluſively: and this is the opinion of Houbigant†. The Septuagint verſion ſeems to favour this interpretation: Και εγραψεν επι των πλακων τα ῥηματα ταυτα της διαθηκης, τους δεκα λογους. The word ταυτα is however wanting in the Oxford MS. in Copt. and the old Ital. as quoted by Auſtin. The order of Compl. is, Και εγραψε τα ῥηματα ταυτα επι των πλακων της διαθηκης, τους δεκα λογους. If this were the genuine reading of the Septuagint, one would think that they meant to ſay that the above precepts were written on the back of the ſame tables which contained the Decalogue; to which circumſtance the author of the Apocalypſe is by ſome thought to allude, when, ch. 5. 1. he ſpeaks of a book written "within and "on the back-ſide," as our common Verſion renders εσωθεν και οπισθεν‡. I know that Grotius and others conſider this as a miſtranſlation, and join και οπισθεν to κατεσφραγισμενον§. But to me they appear to be in the wrong; and I think, with Vitringa, that a ſimilar paſſage in Ezechiel, which the Revelation-writer had evidently in view, decides the queſtion: "He "ſpread it (the volume) before me, (ſays the prophet,) and it was written on the face and "on the back," פנים ואחור. Ezek. 2. 10.—But to return to our preſent text. The Arabic tranſlator Saadias certainly conſidered Moſes as the nominative to *wrote*, as he has וכתב לה, *et ſcripſit ſibi*.—The other verſions are equally ambiguous with the Hebrew; ſave that the Thargumiſts ſo paraphraſe it as to make it appear that they conſidered the *Lord* as the nominative. And indeed there are ſome not weak arguments for that ſuppoſition; for, in the firſt place, the words עשרת הדברים, in the parallel place of Deuteronomy, 10. 4. are evidently

* From theſe words, "Such another Phaſah had not been celebrated from the days of the judges, who judged "Iſrael, nor in all the *days of the* kings of Iſrael, or of the kings of Judah." 2 K. 23. 22. See alſo 2 Chron. 35. 18.

† "Sunt hoc verſu *verba fœderis* eadem de quibus dicitur ver. 27. *verba hæc*, in quibus ipſis verbis docet Deus ſe "ſancire fœdus cum Moſe et cum Iſrael. Atque illa *verba hæc* ver. 27 de iis præceptis enuntiantur, quæ dat Moſi "Deus a ver. 12. uſque ad ver. 27. Cum igitur mandet Moſi Deus, ut *verba hæc* in tabulis deſcribat, conſectarium "eſt, ut eadem illa verba Moſes in tabulis exararit, utque adeo ויכתב *et ſcripſit* de Moſe ſcribente efferatur; denique ut "Moſes in tabulis ſcripſerit, non Decalogum, de quo nihil quidquam habent præcepta mox memorata, ſed illa ipſa "præcepta, quæ ad numerum *decem* vocare ſic poſſis. Nam *primum* præceptum erit, de fœdere non ſanciendo cum "gentibus Chanaan—*ſecundum*, de non conflandis Diis alienis—*tertium*, de paſchate celebrando—*quartum*, de offerendis "Deo primogenitis—*quintum*, de ſabbato cuſtodiendo—*ſextum*, *ſeptimum*, et *octavum*, de tribus feſtis per annum cele-"brandis—*nonum*, de fermento a victimis removendo—*decimum*, de non coquendo hædo in adipe matris."

‡ Other copies have εξωθεν; and ſo Vulg. *intus et foris*. § So Wakefield: "A book written within, and "ſealed on the back."

ſpoken

ſpoken of the Decalogue, or ten commandments, which were written on the two tables of ſtone; and, according to the narration there, written by the hand of God, as they were on the former tables. Secondly, If the יכתב in Exodus relate not to God, it is nowhere elſe ſaid in that book that he wrote the Decalogue on the new tables prepared by Moſes; which, however, we are taught to expect from the command contained in the firſt verſe of the chapter, compared with Deut. 10. 1—4. Hence Houbigant was inclined to think that ſomething had dropped out of the text, and would fill it up thus: ויכתב על הלוחות את דברי הברית · ויכתב יי עשרת הדברים (יהוה), "And he [Moſes] wrote on the tables the words of the [above] cove-" nant; but the Lord wrote the Decalogue." But as there is no veſtige of ſuch an addition in either of the texts, or in any of the verſions, it is not, in my opinion, readily to be admitted.

Moſt modern interpreters ſupply the word יהוה, *the Lord*. So Michaëlis: "*Er* muſs hier " auf Gott gehen, weil ver. 1. Gott geſagt hatte, er wolle ſelbſt die zehen Gebote auf die " neuen von Moſe zubereiteten Tafeln ſchreiben."—So alſo Hezel; and Dathe, who thus paraphraſes: "Atque tabulis illis inſcriptæ erant conditiones harum promiſſionum, nempe " decem præcepta."—I choſe, in my verſion, to imitate the ambiguity of the original, as I was then, and ſtill am, in doubt about the genuine meaning *.

Ver. 29. *He knew not that the ſkin of his face had become reſplendent.* The Hebrew is, לא ידע כי קרן עור פניו; by Sep. rendered ουκ ηδει ὁτι δεδοξασται ἡ οψις τȣ χρωματος (or χρωτος) τȣ προσωπου αυτου; by Jerom, *ignorabat quod cornuta eſſet facies ſua*; which he tells us he had from Aquila, although the Greek of Aquila be loſt. Hence the idea of painting Moſes *horned*. But all the other tranſlators underſtood the word קרן metaphorically: even the very literal Gr. Ven. has ελαμψε.

Ver. 33. *And when he had done ſpeaking to them, he put a veil upon his face.* ויכל משה מדבר אתם ויתן על פניו מסוה.—Some modern interpreters imagine that there is here a *hyſteron-proteron*, and that the words ſhould be rendered, as in our common verſion, "And *till* Moſes had done " ſpeaking with them, he put a veil on his face;" or, as Dathe, *Quando Moſes ad eos loquebatur, velamen faciei ſuæ impoſuit*. They ground this mode of rendering chiefly on the authority of St. Paul, 2 Cor. 3. 13. who ſays: Και ου καθαπερ Μωυσης ετιθει καλυμμα επι το προσωπον ἑαυτου, προς το μη ατενισαι τους υἱους Ισραηλ εις το τελος του καταργουμενου †. But Paul is here acting not the part of an interpreter or of an hiſtorian, but that of a mere allegoriſt. It was

* Archbiſhop Secker's MST. note on the place is in ſubſtance as follows: "Theſe words (in ver. 27.) cannot mean " the Commandments, but the words from ver. 10 to 26. . . . One ſhould then think that *he* who *wrote* in the next " verſe was Moſes, who is commanded *to write* in this; and that the words of the covenant which he wrote, are " thoſe of the covenant in this chapter, and which might eaſily be divided into ten parts. . . . Or, *the ten commandments* " might be ſuppoſed a gloſs: but ὁ, Syr. Chald. and Vulg. have it: and probably it means the ſecond edition of the " Ten Commandments, and that *He* means *God*; who ſaith, ver. 1. that he will write them again: and Moſes ſays, " Deut. 4. 13. and 10. 4. that God did write them again. The Ten Commandments, Deut. 9. 9, 11. are called the " tables of the covenant." † I have not rendered theſe words, becauſe I am as yet doubtful how I ſhould render them. Our public verſion has: "And not as Moſes, *which* put a veil over his face, that the children of Iſrael " could not ſtedfaſtly look to the end of that which is aboliſhed." But Wakefield thus: "And *are* not like Moſes, " who uſed to put a veil upon his face, that the children of Iſrael might not at all look upon that which is *now* " no more."

enough for his purpoſe that it is ſaid in Exod. 34. 30. that when the children of Iſrael ſaw the ſplendour of Moſes's countenance, they were afraid to approach him. Approach him, however, they did, at his own deſire: and Moſes talked with them; during which talk it is not ſaid that he veiled his face. But verſes 34 and 35 (ſay Dathe and others) explain this, and put it beyond all doubt that Moſes put on his veil as often as he ſpoke to the people. I am of a very different opinion, and think that it is clear from theſe very verſes, as well as from ver. 33, that his face remained unveiled all the time in which he delivered to the people his divine oracles, and that it was covered only in common converſation. Not one of the antient interpreters thought of rendering ver. 33 in any other ſenſe. Sep. Και επειδη κατεπαυσε [Μωυσης] λαλων προς αυτους, επεθηκεν επι το προσωπον αυτω καλυμμα.—Vulg. *Impletiſque ſermonibus, poſuit velamen ſuper faciem ſuam.* So equivalently all the other verſions.—With theſe agree the moſt learned Jewiſh interpreters, whoſe opinion is well repreſented by Delgado *. The objections from ver. 34 and 35 are perfectly removed in my verſion. It is but doing juſtice to Houbigant to ſay, that he had well rendered the whole paſſage before me †.

CHAP. XXXV.

Ver. 3. *YOU may not* even *kindle fires.* לא תבערו אש. The ſeverity of this prohibition in ſo cold a country as Judæa in winter is, has given riſe to ſuſpicions that the text has been altered.—The late Mr. S. Street imagined that the true reading may have been לא תבערו אשב; and, pointing after תבערו, would render the precept thus: "Ye ſhall not behave like brutes: "I will dwell in all your habitations on the ſabbath-day."—"In the heathen religious rites," adds he, "many impure and indecent, and even fooliſh and *brutiſh* ceremonies were per-"formed. This accounts for the reaſon of the precept."—That בער ſometimes ſignifies a *brutiſh* fellow (hence the word *boor*) is queſtionleſs; but I very much queſtion if it can have that ſignification here. The reading אשב has no authority but a razure after אש in one of Kennicott's MSS.; and it is more probable that the letter eraſed was ה than ב. All the antients, down to Gr. Ven. read as we now do. But if it were forbidden to kindle fire on

* "By the addition of the word *till*," ſays he, "in the beginning of this verſe, the Engliſh tranſlator plainly diſco-"vers that he did not underſtand the meaning of this paſſage. The uſe of this veil was to cover from the people the "*ſchechina*, or glory, that was on Moſes's face: but *that* he did not dare to do while he was rehearſing the Lord's "words to them; for that glory was his credentials, as if the Lord was ſpeaking to them through his mouth: ſo that "Moſes could not put on the veil till he had done ſpeaking to them, which is quite oppoſite to the meaning which the "Engliſh tranſlator gives to this paſſage, and which is certainly erroneous. And here Moſes, to remove their fears, "accoſted them by degrees; firſt Aaron, then the princes, and then the people; and delivered to them the Lord's word, "without any veil."—Nothing can be better ſaid. † "Et cùm Moſes finem faciebat loquendi, ponebat velamen "ſuper vultum ſuum. Sed cùm Moſes Dominum adibat, ut cum eo loqueretur, auferebat velamen, donec ab eo degre-"deretur; deinde, egreſſus, filiis Iſrael referebat ea, quæ ſibi Dominus mandârat, filiis Iſrael faciem ejus rutilantem "videntibus: qui poſteà velamen in vultum referebat, donec iret, ut cum Domino colloqueretur."—To the ſame pur-port, more latterly Michaëlis, and Hezel, whoſe ſhort note I ſhall here ſubjoin. "Moſes bedeckte ſein angeſicht "nicht wenn er mit Gott redete; auch nicht, wenn er an Gottes ſtatt dem volk einen vortrag zu thun hatte, um den "Iſraeliten dadurch zu zeigen, daſs ihn wirklich ein höheres weſen geſandt habe, und ſeinem vortrag anſehen zu "verſchaffen. Er bedeckte es aber, wenn er ausgeredet hatte."

the

the ſabbath-day, how were the ſacrifices to be offered? I anſwer, that the ſacrifices are here out of the queſtion; it is only in private dwelling-houſes that the kindling of fires is forbidden, and perhaps forbidden only for the purpoſes of cookery; which was not abſolutely neceſſary, as victuals might be cooked the day before. I remember the time when, among the ſtricter Preſbyterians of Scotland, nothing was cooked on Sunday, nor even a pot of water boiled for the purpoſe of making tea. It is probable that the Moſaical precept did not prohibit the lighting of fire in very cold weather. At any rate it was a local precept, which in many climates would have been highly unreaſonable.—It is not unworthy of remark, that, at the end of this verſe, all the copies of Sep. which I have ſeen have εγω Κυριος; and ſo the Coptic verſion.

Ver. 8. From the beginning of this ver. to the end of ver. 19, very different from the arrangement of the Heb. and Sam. texts is that of Sep. in all the editions, except the Complutenſian. Whether its editors adapted their MSS. to the Hebrew order, or found that order in ſome of their MSS. it is yet uncertain. Perhaps Dr. Holmes's complete collation will throw light on the ſubject; but no MS. which I have had occaſion to ſee follows their arrangement, although ſome of them differ conſiderably from the other printed copies.—For the ſatisfaction of ſuch of my learned readers as may not have had an opportunity or leiſure to compare the differences, I ſhall here give, in two parallel columns, the Complutenſian and Roman editions of the whole paſſage; with the Heb. and Sam. varieties below the former, and the Greek varieties below the latter.

COMPLUTENSIAN.	ROMAN.
Ver. 8. Και ελαιον εις την φαυσιν και θυμιαμα εις το ελαιον της χρισεως, και εις την συνθεσιν του θυμιαματος:	* . . .

COMPLUTENSIAN.

12. . . . την κιβωτον . . . . . και τους αναφορεις αυτης, και το ιλαστηριον . . . και το καταπετασμα . . . . . .

13. και την τραπεζαν και τους αναφορεις αυτης, και παντα τα σκευη αυτης, και τους αρτους της προθεσεως:

14. και την λιχνιαν του φωτος, και παντα τα σκευη αυτης, και τους λυχνους αυτης, και το ελαιον του φωτος:

15. και το θυσιαστηριον του θυμιαματος, και τους αναφορεις αυτου, και το ελαιον της χρισεως, και θυμιαμα της συνθεσεως, και το επισπαστρον της θυρας της σκηνης:

16. και το θυσιαστηριον του ὁλοκαυτωματος, και την εσχαραν αυτου την χαλκην, και τους αναφορεις αυτου, και παντα τα σκευη αυτȣ, και τον λουτηρα, και την βασιν αυτου:

17. και τα ιστια της αυλης, και τους στυλους αυτης, και τας βασεις αυτης, και το επισπαστρον της θυρας της αυλης:

18. και τȣς πασσαλους της σκηνης, και τους πασσαλους της αυλης, και τα σχοινια αυτων.

ROMAN.

και την κιβωτον του μαρτυριου, και τους αναφορεις αυτης, και το ιλαστηριον αυτης, και το καταπετασμα, και τα ιστια της αυλης, και τους στυλους αυτης, και τους λιθους τους της σμαραγδου, και || το θυμιαμα | και το ελαιον του χρισματος * :

και την τραπεζαν * . . . . . και παντα τα σκευη αυτης * . . . . . :

και την λυχνιαν του φωτος, και παντα τα σκευη αυτης * . . . . . :

και το θυσιαστηριον, ... και παντα τα σκευη αυτου . . . . .

VARIOUS READINGS.

Ver. 12. corresponds with the Sam. text, which has a copulative before את הכפרת, with above 60 Heb. MSS. and almost all the Versions.—Ver. 13. corresponds exactly with both texts, save that it has a copulative before την τραπεζαν, with 12 Heb. and 3 Chald. MSS. and so Syr. and Saad.—Ver. 14. differs from Heb. in having παντα before τα σκευη, with Sam. and 1 MS. which have כל כליה. But this addition is in no other antient version, except the Coptic, which was made from the Septuagint, and is a secondary proof that such was the original reading. The old Italic of this whole passage has not been preserved.

Ver. 15, 16, 17, and 18, agree with Heb. except that in the Greek there are some more copulatives; all which are supported either by the Sam. text or several MSS. See De Rossi.

VARIOUS READINGS.

Ver. 12. Τα θυμιαματα Ald. and Alex.; but these and the five following words are here wanting in Glasg. Leips. Can. and Copt.—Ib. * Και ελαιον εις το φως, και αρωματα εις το ελαιον της χρισεως, και εις το θυμιαμα της συνθεσεως. Ald. only. But Alex. has here και το θυσιαστηριον και παντα τα σκευη αυτου.—Ver. 13. * Και το ελαιον της χρισεως και παντα τα σκευη αυτης: an evident transposition.—Ver. 14. * Και το ελαιον της χρισεως και το θυμιαμα της συνθεσεως, και το επισπαστρον της θυρας της σκηνης Ald.; and so Can. except that it has του χρεισματος [*sic*] instead of της χρισεως. The addition is also in Glasg.; and all, save the first comma, in Leips. It is also in the Coptic version.

19. και

COMPLUTENSIAN.

19. και τας στολας τας αγιας Ααρων του ιερεως, και τας στολας εν αις λειτουργησωσιν εν αυταις εν τω αγιω, και τους χιτωνας τοις υιοις Ααρων της ιερατειας, και το ελαιον του χρισματος, και το θυμιαμα της συνθεσεως.

VARIOUS READINGS.

Ver. 19. The firſt comma of this ver. in Heb. and Sam. is in Compl. tranſpoſed after the ſecond comma; and the laſt two commas iu Compl. are wanting in both Heb. and Sam. This appears to me no ſlender preſumption that the editors did not mould their Greek according to the Hebrew text, but only uſed Gr. MSS. that were found the moſt conformable to it. In the copulatives the Complutenſian agrees chiefly with Sam. as uſual.

ROMAN.

και τας στολας τας αγιας Ααρων του ιερεως, και τας στολας εν αις || λειτουργησωσιν εν αυταις * . . . και τους χιτωνας τοις υιοις Ααρων της ιερατειας, || και το ελαιον του χρισματος, και το θυμιαμα της συνθεσεως |.

VARIOUS READINGS.

Ver. 19. || λειτουργουσιν, Ald. Alex. Glaſg. Leipſ. Can. —Ib. * εν τω αγιω, Ald. Alex. Glaſg. Leipſ. Can. and Copt.—Ib. || So Alex.; but the whole is wanting in Ald. Glaſg. Leipſ. Canon. and Copt.—Such is the Vatican Copy, with all the varieties which I could collect. When Dr. Holmes's Collations ſhall appear, my readers will have an opportunity of ſeeing the real ſtate of the Septuagint in this reſpect; and perhaps of diſcovering the cauſes of ſo different an arrangement.

Ver. 22. *Claſps.* חח; by our tranſlators rendered *bracelets*, after Jerom and Coverdale. Michaëlis has laboured hard to prove that the word means a *noſe-ring*. I am perſuaded that this, at moſt, can only be its ſecondary ſignification. All the ant. verſions have terms that convey the idea of *faſtening*, *connecting*, and the like. Sep. indeed have σφραγιδας, *ſeals*; but this word, I think, may have originally ſignified *claſps*, for the firſt *ſeals* were probably *ligaments*. Syr. שארא—Onk. and Tharg. שירין—both rendered in Pol. *armillas*; if properly, I doubt. Compare the roots שיר and שרר. Saadias has דסתניק; "the meaning of which," ſays Michaëlis, "is uncertain." I have little doubt of its being a compound word from the Perſ. דסת and דניק, *firmus*, *firmiter compactus*, and that it has the ſame meaning with דסתואנה, which is the word uſed by the Perſic tranſlator, commonly rendered *bracelets*. Arab. Erp. כרסה, which is evidently the ſame with the Heb. קרס. The Sam. Verſion has רעוש, which ſeems to be the Arab. רעס, ſtill giving the idea of *connecting*, *reſtraining*, &c. In fine, Gr. Ven. has πορπην, *a claſp*; and ſo Pagninus, Luther, Caſtalio, Le Clerc, Houbigant, Dathe, and our Bate. Purver has *hooks*, not badly, in the primitive ſignification of the word; and retaining even the literal etymon. *Haak*, in the Dutch dialect, ſtill ſignifies a *claſp*; and the Belgic *hake*, or *haeck*, the German *haken*, the Iſlandic *hake*, are all from the ſame ſource; and our Engliſh *hook*, or, as our Anglo-Saxon anceſtors wrote it, *hóc*, is the very Hebrew word חוח.

Ib. *Collars.* עניל. This word is not in the preſent Hebrew text; but all the copies of Sam. one of Kennicott's MSS. at firſt two of De Roſſi's, and moſt probably other two, in which a word has been eraſed, with one copy of Onk. and Shemath-Rabba, (an old comment on Exodus, mentioned by Norzius,) have all עניל, either with or without the copulative. It was alſo read by Sep. who render it εμπλοκια.—I once thought, and am ſtill ſomewhat inclined to

to think, that עניל here is in connection with the preceding word טבעת; and that טבעות־עניל may denote *circular rings*, to diſtinguiſh them from thoſe טבעות mentioned ch. 25. 26. which I have there tranſlated *ſtaples* *.—Be this as it may, I have no doubt that עניל ſtood originally in the text, and have accordingly retained it in my Verſion.

Ib. *Lockets.* כומז: a word but twice found in the Bible; here and in Num. 31. 50. By Sep. it is here rendered *περιδεξια*; but in Num. *εμπλοκιον*, if the word there be not tranſpoſed, as, with Michaëlis, I greatly ſuſpect. The other ant. verſions vary. Vulg. with Sep, *dextralia*, ornaments worn on the right arm. Onk. מחוך, and Tharg. מחוכין; which Buxtorf, after Elias Levita, ſuppoſes to have been a fillet which was uſed to compreſs the breaſts; *ad comprimendas mammas*. Syr. המניכא, commonly rendered a *neck-chain*; but perhaps it may alſo mean an *arm-chain*, and it ſeems to be the Latin *manica*. Saad. תרכיה, in Pol. rendered *zona ſcutulata*, but by Michaëlis *ornamentum ovale*, from תרכה ovum, ſays he: but תרכה, I believe, never ſignifies *ovum*, an *egg*, properly ſo called; it only ſignifies an *abandoned* egg, particularly of the oſtrich; or perhaps rather the empty ſhell of an egg, left by any bird, after the young has been hatched; and in this ſenſe תרכה comes into the radical ſignification of תרך, *relinquere, deſerere*. I ſhould rather think that the תרכיה of Saadias is a foreign word, the ſame with the Latin *torques* †. Arab. Erp. זינה, by which he probably meant a *zone* or *girdle*, although the word be uſed for any ſort of *ornament*. Perſ. חלחאל, *ancle-chains*, which were of ſilver or gold, and worn by women of faſhion. Gr. Ven. *νυμφοδεσμον*; a *bride-girdle*; if, perhaps, the tranſlator had not in view another meaning, of which preſently. —Such are the verſions of the more antient interpreters. Let us next ſee how כומז has been rendered by more modern tranſlators and commentators.—The Jewiſh writers in general imagine it was an ornament, which either repreſented the female organ of generation, or was appended nigh to it. So Kimhi, זה דפוס של בית הרחם; and Jarhi, "Fuit inſtrumentum "aureum quod dabatur e regione loci mulieris;" and "our Rabbins," ſays he, "make כמז "a compound of the initials of three words, כאן מקום זמה, *Hic locus libidinis.*" Cocceius and Michaëlis laugh at this interpretation; yet it is not altogether devoid of probability, I mean as to the ſignification of the word; for as to its being an abbreviation of three words, that ſmells too much of pure Rabbiniſm to be favoured by rational critics.—The Greek tranſlator of Venice may have had ſome ſuch idea in view when he rendered *νυμφοδεσμον*; and which, perhaps, he conſidered as equivalent to the *ζωναι παρθενικη* of the Greeks; which may have been a ſimilar ornament, for neither its form nor its place is deſcribed by any author, known to me at leaſt.—I have been often inclined to think that כמז was a *phallus*, which was certainly worn by women both in Egypt and in Aſſyria; and which, though commonly of fig-tree wood, might alſo be made of gold, as a more precious and more decorating ornament. Many phallus-gems and taliſmans remain to this day.—What chiefly leads me to this ſuſpicion is the etymon of the word itſelf; for, although neither the Heb. nor Chald. nor Syr. guide us to any ſuch radical meaning, there is in the Arabic a word very like it, which ſignifies *veretrum, penis*; namely, כמדה, from the root כמד, which every ſcholar knows is convertible into

* The two words are in ſimilar contact in Num. 31. 50. where has been a ſmall tranſpoſition, either in the original or in the Septuagint Verſion. See C. R. on that place. † When the Orientaliſts vernaculized Latin words, they were wont to take the ablatives.

כמז *. Nay, the word כמז, without any change of letter, denotes in the ſame Arabic, *rem formæ rotundioris*; and although the change of כ into ת is not ſo common in the Oriental dialects as in the Greek, yet I have little doubt of the תמז of Ezechiel being the ſame with the כמז of Exodus. See the note on Ezech. 8. 14.—However, as this is only etymological preſumption, and as none of the ant. interpreters have thought of a ſimilar meaning, I have, in my verſion, followed that which I deemed the next moſt probable ſignification of the word, namely, a *locket* of ſome undetermined form, and which will not even exclude that of a *phallus*. It was, moſt probably, one of thoſe jewels which the Hebrew women borrowed from the Egyptians. By Dathe it is rendered *globulos*; by Michaëlis, *kugeln*.

Ver. 23. With Saadias, I take the ו in הביאו for the *affix* ſing.; but have rendered, according to the idiom of our language, in the plural, *Theſe they brought*; that is, "every man, "כל איש, brought *that* which he had to give." Hence there is no need for an Italic ſupplement *them*, as in our common Engliſh Verſion.

Ver. 25. Mr. Dimock aſks, if we ſhould not in this verſe read טוה inſtead of טוו? Perhaps we ſhould, with Sam. Syr. Onk. Tharg. and very probably Sep. and Saadias: but then we muſt alſo change the next word יביאו, or refer it, not to the women, but to the men, who brought what the women had ſpun; for all the copies here read in the plural, and all the verſions, except that of Saad. We muſt therefore either read ותביא without any certain authority, or admit a change of nominatives, or read with the preſent text, and ſay that כל אשה is a collective, having the force of a plural; and that טוו and יביאו are *enallegés*.

Ver. 28. In both texts and in all the verſions, ſave Sep.†, הבשם, or, as Sam. better, הבשמים, *aromatics*, precedes שמן, *oil*: but I cannot think that this was the primitive order. It was of *aromatics* that the *unction-oil* and *ſweet incenſe* were to be compoſed; *aromatics* ought therefore immediately to precede them; and in this order they are arranged ch. 25. 6. and in this ſame ch. ver. 8. I have therefore, with Houbigant, followed that arrangement here, as the moſt natural and analogous.

Ver. 35. *Whether of the mechanic or of the artiſt.* חרש וחשב. The former denotes the man who works according to rule, the latter him who contrives and deſigns. The Septuagint, inſtead of חרש, ſeem to have read קדש, as they render τα εργα του αγιου: but there is no veſtige of ſuch a lection either in Kennicott or De Roſſi, and all the other Verſions read as we now do.—Both words are well rendered by Gr. Ven. τεχνιτου, διανοιτου.

CHAP. XXXVI.

Ver. 1. *WISE-MINDED.* Heb. חכם לב. Lit. *Wiſe of heart*, "*wiſe-hearted*," as in our common verſion. But wherever this epithet occurs, the reader is to conſider it as an Hebraiſm. Strictly ſpeaking, a man may be replete with wiſdom, and yet a poor artificer: and here, perhaps, a better verſion would have been *ingenious*, *ſkilful*, or ſome ſuch term. But I was willing to retain as much of the Hebrew idiom as had not become entirely obſelete: I have

* Nothing is more common than the change of the Heb. ז into the Arabic ר.

† In which *aromatics* are altogether wanting in all the copies which I have ſeen, as alſo in Copt. and Ital.

only

only changed *hearted* into *minded*, becauſe *heart*, in modern acceptation, is the ſeat of neither wiſdom, nor ſkill, nor ingeniouſneſs; but of love, hatred, pride, revenge, and other ſimilar paſſions; whereas in the *mind* lodge not only wiſdom, properly ſo called, but prudence, foreſight, genius, contrivance, invention, and every ſkilful art.

For the general difficulties which occur in the remainder of this chapter and in the next, ſee the C. R. on ch. 26 and 27. I will only make a few obſervations on ſome particular paſſages. In

Ver. 7. Mr. Dimock, inſtead of דים, would read די. This idea he may have borrowed from Vulg. in which there is nothing for the affix ם; and, perhaps, from the equally ambiguous verſions of Onk. Tharg. Syr. and Saad.* But all the Heb. and Sam. copies have דים; and ſo Sep. και τα εργα ην ΑΥΤΟΙΣ ικανα. So alſo, explicitly, Erp. Perſ. and Gr. Ven.; and the ſame form is found in Jerem. 49. 9. and Obed. 1. 5. without any variety of lection; ſave that, in the latter place, 3 MSS. have דיים.

Ver. 8. From this to the end of ch. 29. there is a ſtrange diverſity between the arrangement of Sep.† and that of the Heb. and Sam. texts, and of all the other verſions. How this confuſion has happened, it is not eaſy to account for; but it is of antient ſtanding, as it is followed by the Coptic verſion; as moſt probably by the old Italic‡; nor has any MS. yet appeared to vary, in any thing of importance, from the printed editions. Whether the editors of Compl. had any ſuch MSS. before them, is much to be doubted; and we wait, with ſome impatience, for Dr. Holmes's collation of theſe chapters.—If the Complutenſian editors did nothing more than change the arrangement of their MSS. to make them correſpond with the Hebrew order, they are not much to be blamed; although they ought to have warned their readers of their having ſo done. But if, as has been ſuſpected§, they did more than this—if they forged a Greek text of Sep. to make it tally with Heb. and Vulg.; they did a nefarious deed: but I am very unwilling to foſter this ſuſpicion, and truſt that they will yet be found to be as faithful editors here as I can prove them to be in many other places, where they have unjuſtly been accuſed of falſification.

Ver. 38. *The tegument of their capitals.* This, I think, is the true meaning of צפה ראשיהם, without even ſuppoſing the text to be corrupted; for צפה may be a ſingular noun, (the *abſolute* for the *conſtructed*,) although I am apt to think that the original reading was צפוי, as in ch. 38. 17. See alſo Iſaiah, 30. 22. where we have a ſimilar conſtructioni צפוי פסילי. The common mode of pointing and rendering the words contradicts the order in ch. 26. 37. where Moſes is expreſsly bid to overlay, not only the *chapiters* and *fillets*, as they are rendered in our Vulgar Verſion, but alſo the pillars themſelves.

* But there is no plain proof that any of them read differently from the preſent text. † Except Complut. followed by the ed. of Frankfort and that of Venice in 1687. ‡ See Sabatier, vol. i. p. 209.

§ Nobilius in Schol. ad cap. 28. thus expreſſes himſelf: "Hæc. in Vulg. et Complut. habentur, cap. 37. et aliqua ex "parte ad initium 38. Et res, quæ commemoratur, et ordo idem in utraque. Verba etiam, quibus exponuntur in "Compl. propius accedunt ad Vulg. et Hebr. quam noſtra. Veruntamen pleraque illa in collatis codicibus non ſunt "inventa." De hoc dolendum!

CHAP.

CHAP. XXXVIII.

Ver. 8. *UNDER the inſpection of the women, who miniſtered at the entry of the door of the convention-tent.* במראת הצבאות אשר צבאו פתח אהל; for ſuch I take to be the genuine reading; namely, מראת in the ſing. with the preſent Heb. unpointed text and 2 Sam. MSS.; and הצבאות in the plural, with 9 Sam. and 7 Heb. MSS. But how are the words to be rendered? By Sep. thus: εκ των κατοπτρων των νηστευσασων, οἱ ενηστευσαν παρα τας θυρας της σκηνης του μαρτυριου. It would be ſtrange if they found this in the preſent text. They ſeem to have read הצמות in lieu of הצבאות, and צמו for צבאו; but there is no veſtige of ſuch a reading in any Heb. or Sam. copy, or in any of the other Verſions.—Vulg. *De ſpeculis mulierum, quæ excubebant in oſtio tabernaculi.* Pagninus, more literally, *Ex ſpeculis convenientium, quæ conveniebant ad oſtium tabernaculi:* and more ſcrupulouſly ſtill our Engliſh tranſlators—"Of the looking-"glaſſes * of *the women* aſſembling, which aſſembled *at* the door of the tabernacle."—Much in the ſame manner have the words been rendered by almoſt all modern tranſlators; for, though they vary ſomewhat in the rendering of הצבאות and צבאו, they generally agree in rendering מראת or מראות *mirrours.* But when Dathe and Roſenmüller aſſert that all the antient interpreters render in the ſame manner, I apprehend they make a raſh aſſertion †, as ſhall be ſhewn hereafter. But I agree with them in another point; namely, that, although all the antients, as well as moderns, had ſo rendered, the rendering is not admiſſible ‡.—Herman Gideon Clemens (apud Ugolini, tom. 19. p. 1503,) ſaw well that the common verſion was improper; but he has ſubſtituted one, which, in my opinion, is equally indefenſible, although it has been adopted by ſome latter critics of uncommon note. He thinks that מראת ſignifies *figures, images*; and that צבאות ſignifies *adorning*, that is, *elegant*; and that the hiſtorian means to ſay that on the laver were carved *elegant figures*, of cherubs (for example), or other images. Hence Dathe thus forms his verſion: "Porro fecit labrum æneum, "et operculum ejus æneum, cum figuris elegantibus, quæ ornabant oſtium tabernaculi con-"ventûs." That is, "He moreover made a laver of braſs, with its cover of braſs, with ele-"gant figures, which ornamented the door of the tabernacle of convention." I doubt if a more forced explication have been given of any Scripture-text. A more ſpecious verſion, in Clemens's hypotheſis, would be: *Et fecit labrum æneum, et operculum ejus æneum cum conſpicuis ornamentis; ad oſtium tabernaculi conventûs.* But even this interpretation appears to me contrary to both grammar and analogy.—The beſt commentary on the words, I think, is a paſſage in 1 Sam. 2. 22. where הנשים הצבאות פתח אהל evidently means "the women who ſerved, "or miniſtered, at the door of the tabernacle."—Can any thing be more ſimilar? The ob-

* This was a very improper term for mirrours of *braſs.* † "Jam vero verſiones antiquæ unanimi conſenſu "verba textus de ſpeculis mulierum explicarunt." Dathe in loc. ‡ "Quæ explicatio, quanquam eſt quoque "antiquorum interpretum, tamen adeo difficilis eſt et dura, ut mirum videri poſſit eam ſeſe probaſſe tot viris doctis, niſi "experientia doceret, uno errore admiſſo, ſequi deinde plures. . . . Sed tam ſolidè hanc explicationem refutavit Clemens "(Diſput. de Labro æneo), ut eo lecto non putem futurum eſſe qui ſpecula et mulieres textui Hebræo perperam illatas "eſſe neget."—De *ſpeculis,* concedo: non item de *mulieribus.*

jection that נשים is wanting in Exodus is frivolous: נשים is included in הצבאות, as it is in השבאות, in Gen. 24. 11. and in other places.—That washing the feet of men was a part of female occupation, is plain from 1 Sam. 25. 41: "Let thine handmaid," says Abigail to David, "be a waiting-woman, to wash the feet of my lord's servants."—Mary Magdalen washed the feet of Jesus with her tears instead of water, and the apostle Paul ranks among the good qualities of a Christian widow, that she hath washed the feet of the saints: *ει αγιων ποδας ενιψεν.* 1 Tim. 5. 10.—Indeed it was antiently thought no demeaning office for women even of the first quality. Clemens Alexandrinus tells us, that the daughter of Cleobulus, who was both a philosopher and monarch, was not ashamed to wash the feet of her father's guests *.

I am fully persuaded, then, that the meaning of the Hebrew words is precisely what I have given in my Version; or in Latin more literally thus: "Fecitque labrum æneum, et operculum ejus æneum, sub inspectione *mulierum* adstantium (sive, ministrantum) ad ostium tabernaculi conventûs."—Nor is this a new interpretation. I find it in most of our English translations prior to the Bishops' Bible: "He made the laver of brasse, and the sote of it also of brasse, in the SIGHT † of them that did watch before the dore of the tabernacle of witnes." But, in Parker's version, the authority of David Kimhi got the better of grammar and good sense ‡; and *glasses* were introduced into the text, with this curious note: "Rabbi Kimhi saith, that the women brought their looking-glasses, which were of brasse, or fine mettal, and offered them to the use of the tabernacle."—That mirrours were antiently made of polished brass, there is no doubt; but that the laver of the Mosaic tabernacle was made of brazen mirrours, there is not the smallest proof or probability.

I have said that the common version is contrary to grammar, as well as to good sense: I am now going to prove the former assertion. The word מראה, from ראה, though it occurs above an hundred times in the Heb. Scriptures, never elsewhere signifies a *mirrour*: why then should it have that signification here? especially as in the whole Pentateuch a mirrour is not so much as mentioned, under any denomination; nor, indeed, as far as I know, in any Hebrew writing prior to the Babylonish captivity §.

The first time I meet with a *mirrour* in the Bible is in the Book of Wisdom, 7. 26: *απαυγασμα γαρ εστι φωτος αϊδιου, και* ΕΣΟΠΤΡΟΝ *ακηλιδατον της του Θεου ενεργεσιας.* What Hebrew word (if ever the book were in Hebrew) corresponded with *εσοπτρον*, we know not; but it could not, I think, be מראה.

* Ἡ δε Κλεοβουλου θυγατηρ, του σοφου και Λινδιων μοναρχουντος, των ξενων των πατρωων ουκ ηδειτο απονιπτειν τους ποδας. Stromat, l. vi. p. 523. ed. Sylburg. † *Sight* then meant *inspection*, and has still that signification in Lancashire and other counties; and a *sighter*, I believe, in some parts of the island, signifies an *inspector*.

‡ Was it Luther's good sense, or his good star, that led him to translate as he has done? "Und machte das hand-fass "von ertz, und seinen fuss auch von ertz: GEGEN den weibern, die vor der thür der hütte des stifts dieneten." How elegant! and how badly *bettered* by Hezel! "Besser: von (aus) SPIEGELN derjenigen weiber." § I know that Job, 37. 18. has been alleged as a proof, where כראי מוצק has been by moderns rendered *sicut speculum fusum*. But besides that the word here is ראי, not מראה, it is very doubtful whether ראי be well rendered *speculum*. I have endeavoured to shew the contrary in my C. R. on that place. At any rate, it cannot be brought as a proof that מראה, in Exod. has the same meaning, even by those who, with Michaëlis, believe that the Book of Job is the most antient of all Hebrew writings; which, in my opinion, is a flagrant paradox.

I come

I come now to the Oriental Verſions, which have generally been ſuppoſed to corroborate the tranſlation of Sep. and Vulg.; but which, I think, is not the caſe. Onk. has מחזית, ſuppoſed by Buxtorf to be the plural of מחזיתא in *conſtruction*, and by him rendered *ſpecula*. But is not this *gratis dictum?* and may not מחזית be a feminine ſingular of the ſame meaning with מחזי?—The Bab. Thargum has here only חזין, which I hardly think any one would render *ſpecula*.—Syr. has מחזיא, preceded by בית; which why it ſhould be rendered *ſpecula*, I cannot well conceive, as the word every where elſe ſignifies *viſus*, *aſpectus*. The term which the Syr. tranſlator of Wiſdom uſes to expreſs a mirrour is מחזיתא; and the ſame term is employed by the Syr. tranſlator of the N. T. in 1 Cor. 13. 12; and in James, 1. 23. It is obſervable that the Syr. tranſlator of Exod. not only uſes a word which everywhere elſe ſignifies *aſpectus*, but inſerts the word בית before מחזיא, to prevent, as it were, the reader from ſuppoſing that this latter denoted the materials out of which the laver was made *.—Saad. מראי, preceded by מן, and rendered in the Polyglott *a ſpeculis:* but wrongly, I think, for two reaſons: Firſt, מראי elſewhere never ſignifies a *mirrour:* the word uſed for a mirrour, both in the Book of Wiſdom and in the N. T. is uniformly מראה. Secondly, although the prepoſition מן ſometimes ſignifies *a* or *ex*, yet it often ſignifies *ante*, *ad*, *coram*; and is in that ſenſe equivalent to the Heb. ב, *ante conſpectum mulierum*, &c. being equivalent to *in conſpectu mulierum*.—Even Arab. Erp. has מריה, not מראה; which former certainly ſignifies *viſus*, *aſpectus:* but whether it ever ſignify *ſpeculum*, is at leaſt very doubtful.—The Sam. Verſion has חזכיה; but why it ſhould be rendered *ſpecula*, I confeſs I ſee no reaſon. The truth ſeems to be, that the Latin tranſlators of all thoſe Verſions were guided by Sep. and Vulg. without giving themſelves the trouble to analyſe and compare the words of their originals.—The Perſic Verſion has, in my opinion, been treated in a ſimilar manner. His דר נמאישי is rendered *in ſpecie ſpeculorum*; whereas, I think, it ſhould be rendered *in præſentia*, or *in conſpectu*.—Remain the Jeruſ. Tharg. and Gr. Ven. both which have unequivocally words which denote *mirrours:* the former אספקלירי, the latter εσοπτρους.—I now leave the intelligent reader to judge for himſelf which verſion he will prefer.

Ver. 29. *Seventy talents.* The Cod. Alex. of Sep. has 470 talents, τετρακοσια εβδομηκοντα; and ſo Glaſg. Leipſ. and Canon.: and, indeed, when we conſider what was made of the braſs, this appears no improbable calculation, eſpecially if we compare it with the quantities of gold and ſilver. But there is no ſuch lection in any copy of the text, nor in any of the ant. verſions. There is a miſtake in my Var. Readings on this ver. Vol. I. p. 175, where the mark of reference || ſhould be placed in the text after "talents," and in Var. Readings the words *ſeven talents* expunged. Or the marks may remain as they are, and *ſeven* changed into *ſeventy*. But the former mode is the better.

* His Latin tranſlator in the Polyglott renders, *inter ſpecula:* and hence, perhaps, another ridiculous comment, namely, that the laver was placed in the midſt of a number of mirrours. But although בית, the ſame with the Heb. בין, ſometimes ſignifies *inter*, it is here only to expreſs the Heb. ב, and means no more than *in*, as the Heb. בין has ſometimes the ſame ſignification.

CHAP. XXXIX.

Ver. 18. THIS and the four following verſes, and indeed a great part of the whole chapter, are ſo abridged and confuſed in the Latin Vulg. that one is apt to think it could not ſo come from the pen of Jerom.—It is pity that moſt of the old Italic is here loſt.

CHAP. XL.

Ver. 7. *AND ſhalt place water by it.* Here both texts have שם, not שמה, which, however, is the reading of 6 MSS. That the meaning is *by it*, not *in it*, has been ſhewn above. The whole verſe is wanting in all the editions of Sep. except Compl.; but it is found with an aſteriſk in the Colb. MS. in Montfaucon; which MS. has alſo many ſuch additions in this and the three foregoing chapters; probably the work of Origen, to fill up the defects which he found in the copies of Sep.; and perhaps the Complutenſian editors took their text from ſuch like MSS.—Here Compl. has και θησεις εν αυτῳ ὑδωρ; as Vulg. Syr. and Saad. underſtood the text. But the juſt-mentioned Colb. MS. has, more properly, και δωσεις εκει ὑδωρ.—So alſo Onk. Tharg. Perſ. Erp. and even Gr. Ven. which agrees exactly with Colb.

Ver. 27. *On which he made aromatic incenſe to be burned.* The Heb. lit. *he burnt*, &c. But as this was the taſk of Aaron, I have given the phraſe another turn, which the idiom of the original readily admits, both here and in many other ſimilar caſes.

Ver. 34. *The cloud covered the convention-tent, and the glory of the Lord filled the tabernacle.* I ſhall here content myſelf with preſenting to my readers two notes of a very different complexion; the one by a German, the other by an Engliſh, divine.—"Apparet, hanc nubem "eandem fuiſſe ac eam, quæ Iſraelitas in itinere ducebat, de qua cap. 13. 21. Extructo "tabernaculo hæc nubes ſupra illud conſedit, in ſignum, Jehovam ſingulari quadam ratione "ibi eſſe preſentem—Sane neceſſarium erat, ut Iſraelitæ hujuſmodi ſignum aſpectabile præ-"ſentiæ divinæ haberent. Populus enim adhuc rudis et omnia e ſenſibus metiens mox potuiſſet "numinis imaginem e lapide, ligno, &c. formare, atque ita ad idololatriam prolabi, niſi Deus "illâ re ſapienter caviſſet, ne hoc fieret. כבד יהוה videtur fuiſſe ſplendor eximius, quem "nubes illa emiſit.—Vulgaris opinio erat multarum veterum gentium, præcipuè Orientalium, "Deum habitare in luce et ſplendore, cui nullus alius poſſit comparari." Thus Roſenmüller. —How more piouſly the good Biſhop Wilſon: "This book concludes with an account of "another conſtant miracle, vouchſafed them for forty years together, to convince the Iſraelites "of God's eſpecial preſence with them. And the prophet Iſaiah, 4. 5. ſignifies to us, that "this was a figure or repreſentation of Chriſt's continued care over his church; which God "grant he may continue to us and our poſterity for ever!"

LEVITICUS. CHAP. I.

Ver. 2. IT has been well obſerved, by Houbigant and others, that the ſecond part of this verſe is wrongly pointed. The *athnach*, as it is called, ſhould be placed after חבהמה, and not after ליהוה; and this is the punctuation of at leaſt one very antient Sam. MS. It is alſo the punctuation of Syr. and Saadias, and ought, I think, to be that of Sep.; for although, in the Vat. edition, the comma is after Κυριῳ, and although Grabe has pointed the Alex. MS. in the ſame manner, the Complutenſian editors more judiciouſly placed it after κτηνων *, although this be not noticed by Bos; and ſo has Montfaucon pointed the Colb. MS. in his Hexapla. But how will this agree with the και which follows κτηνων? I anſwer, that that και is either an interpolation or a mere expletive, as both it and the Latin *et* often are. It is wanting in Alex. Glaſg. Leipſ. Colb. and I doubt not in many other MSS.—I cannot, therefore, but agree with Houbigant, whoſe verſion is: *Si quis veſtrûm hoſtiam Domino de pecoribus oblaturus eſt, de bobus eam et de ovibus offeretis.* The ſubſtance of his note will be found below †.—Roſenmüller: *Si quis Deo offerre velit donum ex animantibus, id ſumat e bobus vel ovibus:* and although Dathe points differently, his verſion is to the ſame purpoſe; *Si quis veſtrûm Jovæ munus offerre velit, id, ſi ex pecudibus eſt, ſit vel ex bobus, vel ex ovibus, et capris.* The *oves* and *capræ* are contained in one Heb. word, הצאן, which I render *flock*.

Ver. 3. *A male without blemiſh*, &c. That the Supreme Being would imperiouſly require of mankind bloody victims, and even point out the particular animals that were to be immolated upon his altar, it is, to me, highly incredible; but that ſuperſtition, the child of ignorance and fear, ſhould think of offering ſuch ſacrifices, it is not at all wonderful; nor need we think it ſtrange that Moſes, although a wiſe legiſlator, in this indulged the humour of ſo groſs and carnal a people as were the Iſraelites. All the nations around them offered ſimilar victims, from the banks of the Euphrates to the banks of the Nile. The Egyptians, in particular, among whom they had ſo long ſojourned, not only ſacrificed animals to their gods, but ſelected the beſt of their kind: Τους καθαρους αρσενας των βοων, και τους μοσχους, ὁι παντες Αιγυπτιοι θυουσι ‡. Indeed, I have ever been convinced, ſince I was capable of reflection, that the whole ſacrificial and ceremonial laws of Moſes were chiefly borrowed from the prieſts of Egypt, but prudently accommodated by the Hebrew legiſlator to the relative ſituation of his own people, diveſted of profane licentiouſneſs and barefaced idolatry, and reſtrained to the worſhip of one ſupreme God, who created the heavens and the earth, and whom he was pleaſed to call IEUE, IAO, or JEHOVAH. This name, I think, he muſt have learnt in Mi-

* In Ald. there is no comma till after προβατων. † "Genus tangitur in חבהמה pecorum a plebe ſponte "offerendorum, ut poſtea, in הבקר et הצאן, ſpecies aſſignetur: Si tu offeres holocauſtum de pecudibus, offeres de bo- "vibus et ovibus ... ubi obſervandum, non ſacrificia ut fiant imperari, ut rectè obſervat Theodoretus. Nam condi- "tionem habent precepta quæ hìc ſunt: *Si tu offeras.*"—So alſo Secker, in his MS. notes: "Point and tranſlate ... *of* "*the cattle: ye ſhall bring your offering of the herd or of the flock.*" ‡ Herodot. Euterpé. 41. And Chæremon (apud Grotium): των βοων τας θηλειας παρηγουντο.

dian:

dian: that he could not learn it in Egypt, is clear from this, that the name was not known there before he announced it as the name of the *God of the Hebrews*; and JEHOVAH himſelf is made to ſay, on Mount Sinai, that he had never till then manifeſted himſelf by that name: but that the name, before that, was known in Midian, nay that it was the name of the Deity whom Jethro principally, or perhaps excluſively, worſhipped, to me appears very probable from ſeveral circumſtances. In the firſt place, it is not ſo much as hinted that Jethro or his family were idolaters; the only religious-difference between them and Moſes ſeems to have been *circumciſion*. Secondly, when Moſes, on his return from Egypt, tells his father-in-law all that *Jehovah* had done for the Iſraelites, his father-in-law is not, like Pharaoh, aſtoniſhed at the novelty of the name, but rejoices "for all the good things which *Jehovah* had done to "the Iſraelites." Exod. 18. 9.—And again he exclaims, "Bleſſed be *Jehovah*, who hath "reſcued you from the hands of the Egyptians: and now," adds he, "I know that *Jehovah* "is greater than all the other gods*."—But that the name *Jehovah* was at that time not unknown in Midian, in Moab, and even as far as the Euphrates, ſeems clear from the ſtory of Balaam. It is JEHOVAH whom he conſults before he goes with Balak's meſſengers:—"Lodge here this night," ſays he, "and what JEHOVAH ſhall ſay to me I will report "to you." Num. 22. 8. And next morning: "Go back to your own land: for JEHOVAH "permitteth me not to go with you." Ver. 14.—Nay, in ver. 18, he expreſsly calls Jehovah his own God: "I could not go beyond the word of JEHOVAH my GOD."—The ſame language he uſes to Balak himſelf, ch. 23. 3: "Stand thou there by thine altars, while I go to ſee if "JEHOVAH† will meet me."—Again, ver. 8: "How ſhall I execrate whom JEHOVAH hath "not execrated?"—And, ver. 12: "Muſt I not be careful to ſay only what JEHOVAH put-"teth in my mouth?"—Balak, too, uſes the ſame term, ver. 18: "What ſaith JEHOVAH?" And, ch. 24. 13: "From honour JEHOVAH hath precluded thee."—From all this I think it probable that the name JEHOVAH was known in Midian, Moab, and Syria, before the miſſion of Moſes; and that Moſes may have borrowed it thence.—Thoſe who literally believe what is related in the third chapter of Exodus will ſneer at this remark; and they are welcome ſo to do; I will never be angry with any one for believing either too much or too little.

Ver. 9. *It is a ſweet-ſavoured holocauſt to the Lord.* עלה אשה ריח ניחוח ליהוה. It was a common idea among the antients that the fat of ſacrifices was grateful to the gods. Chryſes, the prieſt of Apollo, thus addreſſes him in Homer. Il. α. 39. 40.

———ει ποτε τοι χαριεντ' επι νηον ερεψα,
Η ει δη ποτε τοι κατα πιονα μηρα εκηα
Ταυρων, η δ' αιγων, τοδε μοι κρηηνον εελδωρ.

Ver. 15. *And pinch off its head.* ומלק את ראשו. Some interpreters think that מלק means *not to pinch off*, but *to twiſt back*. This interpretation is chiefly founded on ch. 5. 8. where (ſay they) it is clear that the pigeon's head was not *pinched off*, *but only* twiſted back; as the

* This mode of expreſſion by no means implies that Jethro adored any other Gods with Jehovah, or conſidered him as only relatively ſuperior to other gods. Solomon, in his prayer addreſſed to God himſelf, uſes a ſimilar compariſon: "O Lord! the God of Iſrael! there is no God, either in the heavens above or in the earth below, like thee!" &c.—2 Chron. 6. 14. † So the preſent text; but here Sam. and Sep. have *God*.

Vulg.

Vulg. has here rightly rendered, *retorto ad collum capite.* I will not poſitively ſay that the Vulgate has not rightly rendered, becauſe the meaning of מלק is not eaſily aſcertained. It is thought indeed to be the ſame with the Syr. מלג, and by that word it is rendered in the Syr. verſion; but the preciſe meaning of that word is equally uncertain. In Ezrah, 9. 3. it clearly means *to pluck off, evellere*; being there equivalent to the Heb. מרט. It has the ſame meaning in the New Teſtament, Mark, 2. 23. and Luke, 6. 1. correſponding, in both places, with the Gr. τιλλω.—The ſame may be ſaid of Onk. and the Sam. tranſlator, who retain the Heb. word; but both Thargums have words that denote *avulſion.* Bab. חזם. Jeruſ. עזם.—The פצל of Saad. and of Erp. has certainly a ſimilar meaning; and why the αποκνισει of Sep. ſhould be rendered *retorquebit*, I am at a loſs to know. Nobilius was probably led to this interpretation by the Vulgate *.—The Greek of Venice has αποαυχηνει, *decollabit.*

But is not the meaning of מלק determined by ch. 5. 8. where it is expreſsly ſaid that the head is *not to be ſeparated*, ולא יבדיל?—No, this is very far from being deciſive; the words may relate, not to the diviſion of the head from the body of the pigeon, but to dividing the pigeon itſelf, as was to be done with regard to the larger victims.—The beſt explication of לא בדיל, perhaps, in ch. 5. 8. is, as Parkhurſt remarks, ver. 17 of ch. 1.—After all, I would not poſitively aſſert that the head was ſeparated from the body. The word מלק may ſignify to make a *ſection* or *cut* in the head; perhaps by pinching it with the nails, ſo that the blood might diſtil from the wound. The Perſic tranſlator ſeems ſo to have underſtood it: and there is a Greek verſion (by whom it is uncertain) in Montfaucon which coincides with this idea: λεπισει, *decorticabit, pellem detrahet.*—I have ſeen ducks and geeſe killed in the following manner: they were hung upon a peg by their legs, and a ſlit made in their heads, from the neck, to let out the blood; and there they hung until they were dead. As the great point with the Hebrew legiſlator was, to have the victims thoroughly bled before they were immolated, this might be deemed the beſt way of treating feathered victims; and I confeſs that I am almoſt inclined to believe that this was the caſe.—The heads of other animals were burned along with their quarters; ſo from analogy we might ſuppoſe that the head of the pigeon and turtle-dove was likewiſe burned; but analogy is not always a ſure guide, and the heads of the feathered kind may have been rejected on account of the blood, which would clot and accumulate from the ſection being made there.—I add the verſions of two celebrated modern tranſlators, Dathe and Michaëlis. *Sacerdos ad aram caput ejus ungue reſecet*—"Der prieſter ſoll ſie zum "altar bringen, den kopf abkneipen," &c. So Luther before him, followed by Hezel.

Ver. 16. *With its contents.* בנצתה. Sam. בנצתו. In our common verſion, the word is rendered *with his feathers*; and in this ſenſe it was underſtood by Sep. and Vulg. †, who ſeem to have had before them the Sam. lection. I think נצתה, or rather, as it is in 3 MSS. בוצתה, the genuine reading; but I cannot think that it means *feathers.* It evidently means ſomething belonging to the crop; and in this ſenſe it was underſtood by Onk. Syr. Tharg. Sam. Verſ. both Arabs. and Perſ. It is alſo ſo interpreted by Jarhi, who cites Abba Joſe

* Or, perhaps, by another reading called the *Samaratic*, in the Rom. ed. αναχλασει. † So alſo equivalently Sym. Theod. and Gr. Ven.; and ſo moſt modern tranſlators, even Le Clerc, Houbigant, Michaëlis, Dathe, and Hezel: but not ſo Schulz and Roſenmüller, who ſaw that the context could not well bear ſuch a rendering.

Ben-

Ben-Chanan as being of the ſame opinion. As to the etymon of the word, ſome think it may be derived from the paſſive voice of יצא: I doubt.—Were I to affign it any ſpecial root, it would be the Arab. צהן, which would anſwer, I think, to all the various acceptations of the word, and is peculiarly proper to expreſs the ſwelling form of a bird's crop. Be this as it may, I am perſuaded that נצת, or נוצת, here ſignifies not the feathers of the bird, but *the contents* of its crop; whether we tranſlate it by that word, or, with *Junius*, by *ſordibus* or *fimo*.

CHAP. II.

Ver. 1. *ANY* one. נפש. Lit. *a ſoul*; an Hebraiſm which even our laſt tranſlators thought it right not to retain here, although it was uſed by all their predeceſſors, ſave the Engliſh Genevans. R. Jarhi thinks it is here employed to denote, that if the poor man bring but a poor gift from his *ſoul*, it will be equally acceptable as a bull or a ram. The truth is, that נפש (as Biſhop Horſley has, in one of his ſermons, well obſerved) is often more properly rendered *perſon*: and indeed, in our own language, the two words are frequently confounded. Thus we ſay, that ſuch a place contains ſo many thouſand *ſouls*; and, Not leſs than ten thouſand *ſouls* were ſlain in ſuch a battle.

Ib. *A donative*. מנחה. The verbal root is not found in Hebrew, but it is frequent in Arab. and means *to give*. Hence מנחה means a gift in general of any kind; but when ſpoken of ſacrifices, it denotes any unbloody oblation made to the Lord. Our tranſlators call it a *meat-offering*. A *meal-offering*, or *meal-gift*, would now be more proper, and Syr. has ſo expreſſed it, קורבנא סמידא, *munus ſimilæ*, "a gift of flour."—Sep. δωρον θυσιαν—Vulg. *oblationem ſacrificii*: and ſo equivalently Onk. Tharg. Perſ. and both Arabs.—Gr. Ven. προσφορων μειλιγματος.—The word *donative* appeared to me the moſt proper to expreſs the pure meaning of the original.

Ver. 2. *As a memorial of it*. את הזרתה. Sep. το μνημοσυνον αυτης—Vulg. *memoriale*: and ſo equivalently all the ant. interpreters, ſave Saad. who has פוחהא, *fragrance*; and Erp. who has פיחהא, of the ſame meaning.—According to this, Delgado corrects the Engliſh verſion into "*the ſweet ſavour* thereof;" and quotes Hoſ. 5. 7. *, and Iſa. 66. 3. in ſupport of this tranſlation.—Let us examine them a little. In Hoſ. זכרו is indeed, in our Engliſh verſion, rendered "the *ſcent* thereof," with *memorial* in the margin. But this latter is the rendering of all the antients; nor do I ſee any reaſon for departing from them †. Iſaiah, 66. 3. is alſo quoted by Michaëlis, to ſhew that מזכיר there "ſine dubio eſt *adolens*." Now I doubt very much, and believe that the Greek and Arabic verſions have well expreſſed the meaning: ὁ διδους λιβανον εις μνημοσυνον; and that the marginal reading of our common verſion, "he that "maketh a memorial," is preferable to that in the text; although the latter has been followed by Lowth and Dodſon. See C. R. on Iſaiah.—On the whole, I ſee no good reaſon to depart here, or indeed any where elſe, from the common acceptation of זכר.—If the reader wiſh to ſee what may be ſaid on the oppoſite ſide, he may conſult Michaëlis's *Supplementa* ad Lex. Heb. or Roſenmüller's *Scholia*.

* It is ver. 8, according to the common diviſion. † See C. R. on that place.

Ver. 4.

Ver. 4. *Baked in an oven.* מאפה תנור. Sep. πεπεμμενην εκ κλιβανου—Vulg. *coctum in clibano.*—All the Oriental verſions, even Perſ. retain the Heb. word; which ſhews that it was a common and well-known utenſil in all the Eaſt; yet what was its preciſe nature and form, it is not eaſy to determine; although the word, in one ſhape or other, occurs a dozen of times at leaſt in the Hebrew Scriptures. The firſt time it occurs is in Gen. 15. 17. where it is generally rendered *furnace*; and this, perhaps, is its primitive meaning *. Perhaps the firſt ovens were furnaces.—"It is common through all Aſia," ſays Chardin †, "to make an oven "in the ground four or five feet deep, and three feet in diameter, well plaſtered with mortar ‡. "When it is hot, they place the bread, which is commonly long (like ſome of our morning "tea-rolls,) and not thicker than a finger, againſt the ſides, and it is baked in a moment."—I once thought that a paſſage in Levit. 11. 35. was deciſive againſt this being the meaning of תנור here. It is there ordered, that the *oven*, on which any thing unclean may have fallen, *ſhall be broken.* But the Hebrew word is not there שבר, but נתץ, which ſignifies rather to *deſtroy, demoliſh, undo,* than to *break* in pieces; and is, conſequently, as applicable to an *oven* of the above deſcription as to any other. Nor is it only in the original that the diſtinction is here obſerved: Sep. in ver. 33. has συντριβησεται; in ver. 35 καθαιρεθησονται. So Vulg. in the former *frangendum eſt*, in the latter *deſtruentur.* So Onk. in ver. 33 תתברון, in ver. 35 יתרעון. And ſo, diſtinctly, all the other verſions, except Gr. Ven.; which, in both places, has μιανειται. There is then no cogent reaſon, from that paſſage, to induce us to believe, for certain, that the *ovens* mentioned in Levit. might not be ovens like thoſe deſcribed by Chardin; eſpecially as, in all the other paſſages in which the word תנור occurs, it ſeems to denote a *furnace* rather than an *oven* properly ſo called. There is one paſſage, indeed, which appears to make this controvertible; it is Lament. 5. 10. in which we read: "Our ſkin was "black as an oven, כתנור:" on which Harmer makes the following obſervation: "St. Jerome, "in his Commentary on Lam. 5. 10. deſcribes an Eaſtern oven as a round veſſel of braſs, "blackened on the outſide by the ſurrounding fire, which heats it within §."—If this were the work of Jerom, it would deſerve attention; but it is a ſpurious compoſition, unworthy that critic; and can at moſt give us a vague idea of the *ovens* with which the writer was acquainted.

There is yet another paſſage which may ſeem to throw ſome light on the matter; it is Levit. 26. 26. where, among the other calamities with which the rebellious Iſraelites are threatened, we find the following: "On my breaking your ſtaff of bread, ten women ſhall bake for you "in *one oven:*" that is, there ſhall be ſuch a ſcarcity of bread, that one oven ſhall ſuffice to bake for ten families. This, I think, is a proof that the ovens were ſmall; and a preſumption that, in better times, each family had its own oven; whether that were a furnace dug in the ground, as has been ſaid, or, as moſt modern critics think, a portable ſtone pitcher, ſtill uſed by the Arabs for baking, and which Golius thus deſcribes: "Eſt plerumque in fundo "amplior, ſupernè, ubi orificium, anguſtior: in quo panem coquunt, fere lateribus applicari

* Hence ſome lexicographers have placed it under the root נר. † See Harmer, vol. i. p. 233.

‡ As in ver. 33, when ſpeaking of earthen veſſels. § "In pelle exuſta deformitatem obſcœnam oſtendit, "quam fame, et ſiti, et nuditate, inter hoſtes paſſi ſunt. Clibanus eſt coquendis panibus ænei vaſculi deducta rotun-"ditas, quæ ſub urentibus flammis ardet intrinſecus." Inter opera ſpuria Hieron. tom. v. p. 841.

." ſolitum."—In Scotland, not many years ago, a ſimilar oven was very common, even in genteel families. It was a pot of caſt iron, with three feet, ſet upon hot coals, and covered with an iron lid, on which other coals were placed; and thus, between the two fires, a loaf of excellent bread was baked in a ſhort ſpace of time. I have ſeen, in England, copper ovens uſed for the ſame purpoſe.

Ver. 5. *On a fire-plate.* על המחבת. Sep. *απο τηγανου.* It is evidently the *tagen* of the Arabs, which is deſcribed by Shaw as a ſhallow earthen veſſel like a frying-pan. This was in Barbary: but I am inclined to think that the *tagen* of Paleſtine and Arabia was a flat plate of iron or braſs, convex above, that the fire below might have a greater effect, on which thin cakes were ſpeedily baked; like the Scottiſh *ſcons*, baked on a *griddle*, or *girdle*, which are ſometimes ſo thin that one may twiſt them around his finger.—See Harmer, vol. i. p. 232.

Ver. 7. *In the frying-pan.* מרחשת. Sep. *απο εσχαρας*—Vulg. *de craticula:* and ſo equivalently Syr. and Onk. They took it for a ſort of *gridiron*; but etymology is againſt them, and the word ſeems clearly to denote a frying-pan, *frixorium.* And ſo both Arabs, the Sam. Verſ. Perſ. and Gr. Ven. *; to which we ought to add Tharg. מרתחא, badly rendered *de craticula* in the Polyglott, as no ſuch meaning can be derived from the root רתח. See Buxtorf, Lex. Chald.

Ver. 13. *All your donatives ye ſhall ſeaſon with ſalt: nor ſhall ye withhold from them the ſalt of the portion of your God.* The laſt member of this verſe has been variouſly rendered and interpreted. The Heb. words are ולא תשבית מלח ברית אלהיך; by our Engliſh tranſlators rendered, "Neither ſhalt thou ſuffer the ſalt of the covenant of thy God to be lacking:" and ſo indeed equivalently all the antients, ſave that Saadias explains it thus: "Thou ſhalt "not withdraw from thine oblation ſalt, becauſe it is the covenant of thy God."—With this explanation moſt modern commentators have been contented. Salt, ſay they, among antient nations, was a ſign of friendſhip, as we learn from Homer. At this day, when the Arabian emirs make a league, they eat together ſome pieces of bread ſprinkled with ſalt; and hence the covenant made between them is called BARAT-MILECH, which is only the Heb. מלח ברית inverted. Notwithſtanding the ſpeciouſneſs of this interpretation, it has not given univerſal ſatisfaction. Michaëlis imagined that ברית ſhould be written בורית, and that it has here the ſame meaning as in Jerem. 2. 22. Then מלח בורית will be *pure ſalt*; that is, *ſalt-petre*, or nitre; which it is ſuppoſed was called *pure*, to diſtinguiſh it from *ſea-ſalt*. This is ingenious, but not convincing; for, firſt of all, if the legiſlator had meant to expreſs *pure ſalt*, he would moſt probably have uſed מלח ברור or מלח טהור. Secondly, the only proof, or rather preſumption, that בורית, *borith*, ever ſignifies *nitre*, is founded on this very diſputed paſſage. Thirdly, the word אלהיך would, if that were the meaning of מלח בורית, come in moſt awkwardly. I cannot, therefore, accede to this interpretation, although it has been followed by Dathe and Schulz.

Houbigant endeavours to make a ſort of ſenſe out of the common acceptation of the word ברית, by explaining it allegorically, as if it were conſimilar to *ſweet ſavour*; ſo that the

* Αοπαδος.

meaning

meaning would be: As ſweet odours are grateful to the ſmell, and ſeaſoned things to the taſte, ſo ſacrifices daily offered are agreeable to God, and a pledge of the perpetuity of his covenant with mankind.—It is rare that the good ſenſe of this writer deals in ſuch conceits.

Are then we to acquieſce in the common interpretation? I think, not; were it but for one ſingle reaſon, thus briefly ſtated by Schulz: "This explication is foreign to the purport of "the context, where the queſtion is not whether ſalt was uſed in covenants, but why ſalt, "ordered to be offered with every oblation, ſhould be called *the ſalt of the covenant of God**?"

After a careful examination of the difficulty, I think it is to be reſolved thus. The word ברית here does not ſignify *covenant*, but *food*, from ברה. It is found in this ſignification three times in one chapter of 2 Sam. 13. 5, 7, 10.—It is here viſibly in conſtruction, governed by מלח, and governing אלהיך. The literal verſion then will be *ſal edulii Dei tui, the ſalt of the food, or portion, of thy God.* See ch. 3. 11. where that part of the ſacrifice which was burnt on the altar is called "the *food*, or *aliment*, לחם, of a †ſweet-ſavoured| burnt-offering to the "Lord."—This part of the ſacrifice was the ſuppoſed portion of the Deity: it would have been unbecoming not to make it as ſavory as poſſible. Another phyſical reaſon was ſuggeſted to me by the late Mr. Street, which I ſhall give in his own words: "The ſalt made the fire "burn faſt and clear. Cooks frequently throw ſalt on, to prepare a fire for broiling; and "common ſea-weed, when dried, has the ſame effect."

Ver. 14. The learned reader will ſee, that in the rendering of this verſe I have not ſcrupulouſly obſerved the order of the Hebrew, in which the words גרש כרמל follow קלוי באש, which obliged our Engliſh tranſlators to inſert the word *even*. By tranſpoſing them to their proper place, according to our idiom, the expletive is rendered unneceſſary.—I have rendered גרש, *rubbed out*, not *beaten out*, becauſe I believe the word has never this laſt ſignification; although it was ſo underſtood by Sep. and Jerom, the former having ερικτα, the latter *confringes*. The other ant. verſions have, by their Latin tranſlators, been made to ſpeak the ſame language; but, for the moſt part, falſely; for, neither the פרכן of Onk. nor the גרישא of Saad. nor the מהשם of Erp. have, certainly, that ſignification: on the contrary, I am perſuaded that they all convey the idea of *friction*, not of *contuſion*; as well as the פריכתא of Syr. which his tranſlator has properly rendered *fricta*‡.—The Sam. ver. has גרס, the Heb. גרש, which his Latin tranſlator not badly renders *abſque gluma*; i. e. rubbed out of its huſk.—I cannot think, then, that גרש ſignifies *comminutum, pounded ſmall*; yet celebrated modern critics have not only adopted that interpretation, but improved upon it, by rendering the next word כרמל, *ſicut arenam*, making it a compound of the prefix כ and רמל, which in Arab. ſignifies *ſand*: ſo that, according to them, the parched ears were pounded as ſmall as ſand: *comminuta inſtar arenæ*. So Michaëlis and Roſenmüller, who force the Syr. tranſlator into their ſervice, becauſe, after the word פריכתא, he adds מדכיתא, as if this word were derived from the Heb. דכך, or the Chald. דכא §. With the good leave of theſe critics, I will venture to ſay that the

* "Sed aliena eſt hæc explicatio a contextu, ubi non quæritur, num in fœdere ſal ſit adhibitus; ſed cur ſal, in om-"nibus oblationibus adhibendus, *ſal fœderis divini dicatur?*" ‡ The Latin *frico* is, I doubt not, from the "ſame root. § "Ita etiam ſine dubio Syrus hoc vocabulum interpretatus eſt: habet enim מדכיתא, quod cum "Michaëlis ad. דכא *pulvis* referre et hinc vertere malim *pulveris in modo comminuta*. Nam ſignificatio ſpicæ viridis, "quam voci כרמל vulgò tribuunt, non poteſt probari, et planè precariè adſumpta eſt." Roſenmüller in loc.

Syr. verſion cannot bear ſuch a meaning, and that מדכיתא is well tranſlated in the Polyglott *purgatas*. Michaëlis, in his edition of Caſtell's Syr. Lexicon, has taken for granted, but has not proved, that ever דכא in that language ſignifies *ſand*, or indeed in any other dialect. In Chald. indeed, it has ſometimes the ſame meaning as the Heb. דכה and דכך; but even then it could only correſpond with the word גרש, and not with כרמל. But there is not a ſingle example, I believe, where, in the Syr. דכא has any other meaning than that of *pure*, *clean*, *purified*, &c. What Michaëlis adds with reſpect to the Syr. verſion is a miſtake: "*Spicæ* "*fictæ*, quas Biblia habent Polyglotta, ex conſueta ſumptæ Hebraici כרמל interpretatione: "vocabulum certè Syriacum vix poteſt *ſpicas* ſignificare."—But it is not the word כרמל, which in Pol. is rendered *ſpicas fictas*, but the word before it, פריכתא; the former being rendered *purgatas*; not ſo improperly, perhaps, as may at firſt ſight appear.

For, to proceed to the explication of כרמל, which is commonly placed by Lexicographers among the quadriliteral radicals, but which Michaëlis would make a compound of כ and רמל, it is certainly not eaſy to ſay what is its real etymon or its preciſe ſignification, although it occurs, either as a proper name or as an appellative, at leaſt forty times. As a proper name, it is thus explained by Origen *επιγνωσις περιτομης*, by Jerom rendered *ſcientia circumciſionis:* a moſt ridiculous etymon.—Simonis: *arvum viride*, "the green field;" ſo called from "the *verdant* "*meadows* which ſurrounded it:" but he ventures not to analyſe the word, conſidering it, no doubt, as a radical.—As an appellative, it may ſometimes have the ſame meaning, as in Iſaiah, 16. 10.—29. 17.—32 15, 16.; and in Jerem. 4. 26.—48. 33.; and in ſome other places, where our common verſion has *a fruitful field*, *a fruitful place*, *a plentiful field*, which rendering ſhall be appreciated in the proper places. But here, and again in ch. 23. 14. it cannot poſſibly have any ſuch meaning, The laſt quoted text runs thus: ולחם וקלוי וכרמל לא תאכלו; rendered in our common verſion, after Pagninus: "And ye ſhall eat neither "bread, nor parched corn, nor *green ears*, &c." I do not think that *green ears* expreſs the full meaning of כרמל: but what a figure would Michaëlis's interpretation, *as ſand*, make here!—I wonder that this paſſage did not lead him to ſee the abſurdity of his raſh conjecture.

But what, then, is the preciſe meaning, and what the genuine etymon, of כרמל?—I am ſorry to ſay, that the anſwers which I have to give to theſe queries are not quite ſatisfactory to myſelf; I will give them, however, and leave the critical reader to judge. In the firſt place, it is clear, I think, that the word relates to ſome *quality* of ears of corn; but whether it denote their *greenneſs*, or their *fulneſs*, or their *ſelection*, it is not quite ſo certain.—I then take כרם to be the radical word, and ſeek its primitive meaning in the Arabic, where it frequently occurs, and in various ſignifications, but which are all, I think, reducible to one general idea, *generous*, *liberal*, *precious*, *excellent in kind*. It is particularly uſed to denote a *generous fertile ſoil*; *bona fœcunda terra*, *terra egregias plantas producens*, *ſegete ſincerâ egregia*, &c. Hence, no doubt, כרם, the name of a vineyard both in Heb. and Arab.; and in the latter כרמה is the *generous* vine itſelf. But it is equally applicable to any other *generous* plant or vegetable, and conſequently to *generous*, *plump*, *well-filled* ears of corn: and it was out of ſuch ears that the Iſraelites are here ordered to rub out the oblation which was to be offered to the Lord. But how came the *lamed* to be added? As an augmentative, I conceive, ſtanding in lieu of אל.

אל. Hence *Carmel*, as a proper name, will ſignify *the vineyard of God*, or any other ſpot of *generous* earth deſerving of ſuch an epithet; which agrees perfectly both with the mountain and the city of that name *. By a like hyperbolé, the plain of the Jordan, before the deſtruction of Sodom, is ſaid to have reſembled *a divine paradiſe, or garden of the Lord*: כגן יהוה †.

The above, I think, is the true etymon of כרמל: and its meaning here ſeems to be *choice, full, plump, generous*, according to the primitive meaning of כרם.—Some future critic, perhaps, will deem my conjecture as raſh and abſurd as I have called that of Michaëlis. Well; let him find a better etymon, and a more applicable ſignification.

CHAP. III.

Ver. 5. THIS verſe is incomplete in all the copies and verſions, except Sep.; I mean Rom. Alex. Canon. and the Coptic verſion; for the other copies which I have ſeen are more or leſs defective, but none ſo much ſo as the preſent text. The laſt comma, επι τ̃ θυσιαςηρι̃ω, "on the altar," is wanting in Glaſg. Leipſ. Oxon. and in the Compl. and Ald. editions.—For the reſt, one of De Roſſi's MSS. has הכהנים, "the prieſts," after Aaron; and ſo Syr. ‡.—Saadias has a ſingular reading of the whole verſe: "And a prieſt ſhall burn it on the altar, as "a ſweet-ſavoured ſacrifice to the Lord §."

Ver. 8. It is clear, I think, that the words יהוה and פתח, or, at leaſt, לפני יהוה, have been dropped out of the Text. One MS. has the two latter words inſtead of לפני אהל מועד; and there is a veſtige of ſuch a reading in ſome Gr. MSS. which have κατα προσωπον επι τας θυρας, κ. τ. λ.—But I am perſuaded the true reading has been preſerved by Syr. which I have expreſſed in my verſion.

Ver. 9. This, I think, is evidently a medicinal precept. "Bilious diſorders are very fre-"quent in hot countries: the eating of fat meat is a great encouragement and excitement "to them. The fat of the large tail of the eaſtern ſheep is reckoned a luxurious delicacy; "but I have been told, by one who had eaten of it, that it is not wholeſome." MS. note of Mr. Street.—To this I can bear a perſonal teſtimony: one ounce of fat, eaten at any time, would go near to kill me; and I am convinced that moſt of bilious, and many other bodily diſorders, are owing to the uſe of fat meats.—Of the ſame nature is the precept in

Ver. 17. Where blood is forbidden to be eaten: "Quod interdictum," ſays Roſenmüller, "ſine dubio reſpiciebat ad valetudinem in Orientalibus illis regionibus, in quibus ſanguis citius "in putredinem abit, ideoque in cibum noxior eſt, quam in noſtris Septentrionalibus regio-"nibus."—The ſubject is well handled in Michaëlis's *Moſaiſches Recht*, part iv. ſect. 206, p. 215, of the ſecond edition.

* "Carmelus eſt totus viridis, plenus arboribus, in vertice quidem pinis et quercubus, ad radices verò olivis et lauris. "In medio monte eſt locus amœniſſimus, nemoribus plenus, qui creditur eſſe *ſaltus Carmeli*." Philip. a S. Trin. in *Itiner. Orient.* apud Simonis. See more on this matter in C. R. 2 Kings, 19. 23. † The original reading was, probably, גן אלהים; which was read by Sep. and Syr. ‡ But in the Ambroſian Eſtranghelian MS. this addition is wanting. See De Roſſi. § ויקתר דאך אלאמאם עלי אלמדבח קרבאנא מקבולא מרציא ענד אללה.

CHAP.

CHAP. IV.

Ver. 1. DATHE and Roſenmüller think that ſome words are evidently wanting at the end of this verſe, namely, *let him expiate his ſin by a ſacrifice* *: but there is no veſtige of ſuch a ſupplement in any text or verſion; nor is it, indeed, in the leaſt neceſſary. It is quite in the Scripture ſtyle, firſt to put a general condition, and then to apply it to individuals. So, in any other language, a legiſlator might ſay to a nation: "If any of you commit ſuch and ſuch a crime, "and if that perſon be of ſuch a rank, &c. let him be puniſhed thus; if of ſuch another "rank, let him be puniſhed thus." It would be uſeleſs, it would be frigid, to add, after the firſt *comma*, "Let him be puniſhed."—I am willing to admit that many mutilations have been made in the text, through the negligence of tranſcribers; but moſt of them may be reſtored by the authority of MSS. or of the antient verſions, and ſometimes, although rarely, by analogy and critical conjecture, eſpecially where the mutilation is only a ſingle letter or word; but we are not to ſuppoſe the mutilation of whole phraſes, without very cogent, evidently cogent, reaſons.—The addition in

Ver. 7. of נשאר is more reaſonable, both becauſe it is in P. P. ch. 5. 9. and expreſſed in the Latin and Arabic verſions; yet I would not ſay that it was ever in the original text. It is equally wanting in the Sam. copies, in Sep. Syr. Onk. Tharg. Perſ. Arab. Erp. and Gr. Ven. I would not therefore inſert it in the text, but would have no ſcruple in putting it in a tranſlation, becauſe it is evidently implied in the text; and this it was, I have no doubt, that made Jerom and Saadias ſupply it in theirs. Le Clerc and Roſenmüller employ an odd ſort of argument to juſtify the inſertion of נשאר. "Nam *omnis* abſolutè non poteſt dici, quum una "ſanguinis pars in ſanctuario adſperſa fuerit." But, ſurely, they were not ignorant that כל in the Hebrew idiom, often, very often indeed, denotes only the *greater part* of a thing, and not an abſolute totality. The quantity of blood which was ſprinkled in the ſanctuary was ſo ſmall, that the remainder might, without any impropriety, be called *the whole*. The ſame phraſe is repeated in ver. 18, without any variety of lection, ſave that Vulg. and Saad. ſupply *the reſt*, as here.

Ver. 15. *And the ſteer being ſlaughtered.* Delgado has a very proper remark on this place: "Our common verſion has, *And the bullock* (bull) *ſhall be killed*; this is right, and ſo it "ſhould be rendered in all other places, where the Engliſh tranſlator tranſlates it *and he ſhall* "*kill*; for it is no matter who kills the beaſt; ſo that they (he means the word ושחט wherever "it occurs) are all imperſonal."

Ver. 17. There is ſome variety of lection in this verſe, but of little importance. I have followed Sam. Sep. and 1 MS. and adopt Roſenmüller's remark: "Totus hic locus emen-"dandus videtur ad ver. 6, ubi eadem formula. Solet enim Moſes, ubi de eadem re loquitur, "una eademque verba retinere."

* "Hoc enim ſupplendum eſſe, manifeſtè docent quæ ſequuntur. Nec poſſunt pro *apodoſi* haberi ultima verba "ver. 3, quia hoc verſu, non de omnibus Iſraelitis, ſed tantum de pontifice maximo ſermo eſt. Noſtro ver. dicit legiſ-"lator, omnium peccata per errorem commiſſa certis ſacrificiis debere expiari: tum vv. ſeq. quid ſingulis ſit facien-"dum, docet."

Ver. 22.

Ver. 22. *If it be a chief.* נשיא. It means a perſon of *elevated* rank; chiefs of tribes, or other ſuperior officers of ſtate.

Ver. 29. *In the place* || *where the victims are ſlaughtered* |. The preſent text has only במקום העלה; but Sam. has במקום אשר ישחטו את העלה; and ſo Sep. εν τῳ τοπῳ, ου, (or ᾧ) σφαζουσι τα ὁλοκαυτωματα. So alſo both Sam. verſions, that in the Polyglott, and the Barbarini Sam.-Arab. MS. which has פי אלמוצד אלדי ידבחון צעידה, *in loco in quo mactant victimam.* The ſame addition is found in one of Kennicott's Heb. MSS. and is the marginal reading of one of De Roſſi's *, with this difference only, that they read ישחט העלה inſtead of ישחטו את העלה.—One of De Roſſi's Chald. MSS. and the Bab. Thalmud, have the ſame reading; and the latter has, with Sam. את before העלה. Another of De Roſſi's manuſcripts has an equivalent reading, but paſſively, חשחט העלה, *let the victim be ſlaughtered.* Such ſeems to have been the reading of Syr. and ſo read the Heb. and Sam. text, ch. 6. 18, al. 25†, without any variety of lection in the copies of either; although, there alſo, the Septuagint read actively in the plural σφαζουσι. Both readings are of the ſame import.

Ver. 31. *A ſweet-ſavoured* burnt-offering. In the preſent texts there is nothing for *burnt-offering*, and therefore I have put it in Italics; although, in ſuch caſes, it is always implied. One of Kennicott's MSS. has על אשי; a veſtige, poſſibly, of עלה אשה: and the Syr. tranſlator ſeems to have found עלה, at leaſt, in his copy, as he has קורבנצ למריא.

Ver. 33. [*As a ſin-offering.*] לחטאת. So both texts, and all the verſions except Sep.; I mean Vat. Alex. Glaſg. and Copt.; for the Complutenſian edition has περι της ἁμαρτιας ‡ after τουτο; and Ald. with MSS. Sar. Leipſ. Canon. have περι ἁμαρτιας; yet it has much the air of an interpolation, and I have accordingly put it within brackets.

CHAP. V.

Ver. 1. THIS verſe is variouſly rendered and variouſly underſtood. Sep. thus: Εαν δε ψυχη ἁμαρτῃ, και ακουσῃ φωνην ὁρκισμου, και ὁυτος μαρτυς, η ἑωρακεν η συνοιδεν, εαν μη π αγγειλῃ, ληψεται την ἁμαρτιαν.—Vulg. *Si peccaverit anima, et audierit vocem jurantis, teſtiſque fuerit, quod aut ipſe vidit, aut conſcius eſt: niſi indicaverit, portabit iniquitatem ſuam.* And ſo equivalently, and ambiguouſly, all the ant. tranſlators, except Saadias, who, to me, ſeems to have well underſtood the meaning of his original. It is not here queſtion of informing againſt a ſwearer, as Houbigant and others have imagined; nor does it relate to the witneſs who has been adjured to tell the truth, as Michaëlis, Dathe, Schulz, and Roſenmüller, after Jarhi, underſtand the text; but either to him who, having heard another perſon give an oath, neglects to give his teſtimony againſt it if he know it to be falſe; or who, having heard the *words of a* public

* The famous MS. that belonged to the late Pope, and which has many other valuable readings. See De Roſſi's *Diſſertation* on it, and his *Var. Readings.* † In the common diviſion of chapters, ch. 5 has only 19 verſes: but ch. 6 has 30 verſes; and, in the Polyglott, not only all the verſions, but the Heb. text itſelf, is thus divided; and ſo it is in the editions of Plantin. But in the MSS. and in the editions of Bomberg, Athias, and Vanderhooght, followed by Kennicott, ch. 5 has 26 verſes, but ch. 6 has 26. I have followed this diviſion for the ſake of reference; but, when I have had occaſion to quote, noted the other by an *alias.* See Explan. Note on ver. 20, vol. i. p. 186.
‡ In Bos της is omitted.

adjuration,

adjuration, made for the purpoſe of diſcovering ſome fact, like an epiſcopal monitory, neglects to come forward, in conſequence, with his teſtimony to what he knows on the ſubject.—This laſt opinion is adopted and well explained by Delgado: "The meaning is," ſays he, "that "when evidences are wanted, the judges order a proclamation to be iſſued for any one who "knows any thing concerning it to come and declare it in court; and commonly a curſe is "joined to it in caſe any ſhould neglect or refuſe to be evidence. Now this man's ſin is, "that he heard the proclamation, and yet did not appear to give evidence."—This is certainly a very rational interpretation, and I think the true one. *The voice of ſwearing*, then, in our Vulg. verſion, is improper; but the φωνην ὁρκισμου of Sep. is perfectly right.

Ver. 6. *His guilt-offering.* אשמו, not חטאתו. Hence Michaëlis and others have ſuppoſed that the ſins mentioned in this chapter are ſins of *omiſſion*, as thoſe mentioned in the former are ſins of *commiſſion*. But this diſtinction appears to be arbitrary; for in the preceding chapter likewiſe, ver. 3, the ſin is called אשמת; and in Gen. 26. 10. Abimelech reproaches Iſaac for having, by a lie, expoſed his wife to be abuſed; whence guilt, אשם, might have been incurred. Surely this *guilt* would not have been a ſin of *omiſſion*. So in Levit. 6. 5, 6. the ſin is called אשמת, and the ſin-offering אשם; although the ſin, for which it is offered, be a poſitive lie, accompanied with an act of injuſtice. But is there no difference then between חטאת and אשם? One would think there were; yet it is difficult to ſay in what it conſiſts. The Thalmudiſts ſay that אשם was *a doubtful guilt:* I ſhould be apt to think that it was a ſin of *criminal careleſſneſs*, and in that diſtinguiſhed from ſins of *ignorance* and *inadvertence.*

Ver. 7. *If he cannot afford a ſheep, let him bring either two turtle-doves or two pigeons.* Pigeons were ſo plenteous in Paleſtine and the neighbouring countries, that he muſt have been poor indeed who could not afford a pair. Adrichomius tells us, that there was a ſingle tower to the ſouth of Jeruſalem in which 5000 doves neſtled. See alſo Maundrel's *Journey from Jeruſalem to Aleppo*; and Harmer. vol. i. obſerv. 28, p. 222.

Ver. 15. *Of the value of two ſhekels.* The Heb. is בערכך כסף שקלים, in our common verſion rendered, "with thy eſtimation by ſhekels of ſilver;" as if the value of the ſheep were to be eſtimated—by whom? By Moſes, ſays Roſenmüller. Then the precept could not be a permanent one. Yea, when Moſes died, the right fell to the magiſtrates.—Le Clerc ſupplies thus: "Pro eſtimatione tua," *O ſacerdos!*—But, as Houbigant juſtly obſerves, the words are directed neither to Moſes nor to the prieſt, but to the people of Iſrael, through the mediation of Moſes; and Houbigant's argument againſt Le Clerc, in favour of the ant. verſions, appear to me unanſwerable *. In fact, all the antient verſions, ſave Perſ. and Gr. Ven. even the very literal Arab. Erp. have nothing equivalent to *thy*. Sep. τιμης αργυριου σικλων—Vulg. *qui emi poteſt duobus ſiclis*—So Onk.: בפורסניה, *eſtimatione*—Tharg. בעלוייה, *eſtimatione*—Syr. בדמיא, *pretio*—Saad. בקימתה, *pretio*—Arab. Erp. בתקוים, *eſtimatione.*—All ſuppoſe that the ram was to be eſtimated at not leſs than two ſhekels of ſilver; for that שקלים is here in the dual number, is evident from the whole context. But, ſay Roſenmüller and others, if this were the meaning, the בערכך, *ex eſtimatione tua*, would be ſuperfluous. It would ſo, if it were ſo

* See his Note on this verſe, and that on ch. 27. 2. too long to be here inſerted.

to

to be rendered; but not ſo as the antients have rendered it, and as the ſenſe of the whole paſſage obliged them to render it. Did they then read בערכך in their copies of the text?*—Moſt probably they did, as both the Sam. and Heb. copies all ſo read. But they did not think that the final ך in the בערכך ſhould be rendered *thy*. They either conſidered it as a *paragogical* or *emphatical* letter, as Houbigant will have it to be; or, as I think, a mere Hebraiſm, like, *As thou goeſt to Egypt, as thou comeſt to Gerar,* and an hundred ſimilar modes of phraſing, which we commonly render *imperſonally, as one cometh, as one goeth.* So that, even granting the final ך to be here a ſuffix, and not an emphatic, I ſee no reaſon why we ſhould expreſs it in Engliſh. The meaning is, that the ram muſt be worth two ſhekels, as nearly as his value can be eſtimated. Every other interpretation appears to me to be repugnant to the context and the ſcope of the legiſlator.—Of a different opinion, however, are Michaëlis, Dathe, Schulz, and Hezel, who amends Luther's excellent verſion thus: Beſſer: "Deſſen "werth du (Moſes) nach ſilberſeckeln, und zwar nach ſeckeln des heiligthums, vorſchreibeſt, "beſtimmeſt;" partly borrowed from Michaëlis.—Dathe thus: "Cujus pretium ex ſiclis ar-"genteis, in rebus ſacris uſitatis, definies."

Ver. 17. I have ſaid, in Explan. Note, that, if this be not an interpolation from ch. 4. 27. it muſt be reſtricted to ſuch inadvertent tranſgreſſions as reſpected ſacred things; which ſeems to be confirmed by the concluſion of ver. 19. Or, perhaps, the negative לא has been miſplaced, and ought to be read before עשתה in the firſt comma of the verſe; ſo that the colon ſhould run thus: אשר תעשינה ' מכל מצות יהנה עשתה אחת רלא; and this is the order in which the words are arranged by Michaëlis and Roſenmüller†. Yet I doubt of the propriety of this arrangement. All the antients, down to Gr. Ven. read as we now do; nor is there any variety of lection in either text, ſave that two of Kennicott's MSS. want לא after אשר; but have it not, where Michaëlis would place it, before עשתה; and, indeed, this collocation appears to me to be awkward and uncouth, and I doubt if ſuch another phraſe is to be found in the Heb. volumes. We muſt, then, either ſuppoſe the verſe to be interpolated from ch. 4. 27. which I am not willing to allow, or ſay that the caſe here differs from the caſe there in this, that the latter regards common ſins, where *ſacred* things are not concerned; but that the former relates to a tranſgreſſion with reſpect to thoſe precepts that relate to divine worſhip, or any thing belonging to it; as it ſeems clear from ver. 15. Hence a more coſtly guilt-offering is required.—Dathe's verſion is: *Si quis peccatum commiſerit, in ullo aliquo eorum, quæ lege divinâ interdicta ſunt, neque hoc intellexerit,* &c.

Ver. 21. (In our common verſion ch. 6. 2.) *A depoſit.* תשומת יד. Lit. *depoſitio manus*;

* I once conjectured that the original reading might have been בעדך ככסף שקליכם, and that the firſt *caph* in ככסף might have been afterwards disjoined from it, and added to בערך; but this muſt have happened to a Sam. copy, or to an Heb. one before the introduction of final letters. † "Si communem lectionem ſequimur, oritur inexplicabilis "difficultas. Capite enim proxime antecedenti, ver. 28. 32. dixerat Moſes, *Si quis privatus peccatum commiſerit contra "precepta* אשר לא תעשינה, (id vero eſt *peccatum commiſſionis*) offerendam eſſe *capellam* aut *ovem femellam:* ex lectione "verò recepta idem Moſes, hoc loco, pro peccato commiſſionis *arietem* integrum jubet: et ita ſibi apertè contradicit. "Optimè hæc difficultas tollitur per conjecturam Michaëlis, qui לא inter verba תעשינה et אשר delendum, et ante עשתה "in prioris hujus commatis membro ponendum putat. Ita etiam manet diſcrimen, quod ſupra inter חטאת et אשם "conſtituemus, et quod etiam infra, ver. 21, 22, locum habet."

in our Engliſh tranſlation rendered *fellowſhip*. So Sep. περι κοινωνιας; and ſo equivalently moſt of the ant. verſions. But Jerom took it to be only an explanation of the preceding word, as he renders—*depoſitum, quod fidei ejus creditum fuerit*.—The Greek of Venice has a very ſingular verſion: ενβολη (for εμβολη) χειρος.—I ſee no reaſon to depart from the radical meaning of שום; and Bate, I think, has well rendered the words, "about any thing lodged "in his hand;" that is, any *depoſit*, properly ſo called. In this ſenſe it is not quite the ſame with פקדון; this latter denoting any *truſt* or *charge* whatever, the former a real *depoſit, in manus traditum*. So Schulz and Dathe; but Michaëlis and Roſenmüller adopt the other opinion.

CHAP. VI.

Ver. 13. al. 20. *ON the day in which he or they ſhall be anointed.* ביום המשיח אתו. Sep. εν τη ἡμερᾳ, ᾗ αν χρισῃς αυτον. Vulg. more literally, *in die unctionis ſuæ*. So equivalently all the antient verſions except Saadias, who has מנד יום, *from the day*, &c.; but Erp. פי יום, with the reſt; and Gr. Ven. εν τη ἡμερᾳ του χριεσθαι ε. So, generally, even the lateſt modern interpreters. But Roſenmüller thinks that ב is here equivalent to מ, and that we ſhould render *from the day in which*, &c. as the Arabic tranſlator underſtood it *; and that the precept relates to the daily ſacrifice which the high-prieſts were obliged to make from the time of their conſecration. That ב may ſometimes, not often, be rendered *from*, without detriment to the meaning of the text, I allow; but I believe it is, even in thoſe places, never to be confounded with מ, and may in every one of them retain its own proper ſignification. All the inſtances in Noldius are reſolvable into *in*, *on*, or *by*; the two ſelected by Roſenmüller not excepted—Exod. 12. 15. and Jud. 10. 8. In both places the ב marks the period *when*, and not the period *from which*: yet, in moſt of theſe places, we may render *from*, as I myſelf have done in Exod. But here I doubt much if we can take that liberty, as there is no *terminus ad quem* mentioned in the text. Much ſtronger is his argument drawn from the teſtimony of Joſephus, who ſays that the prieſt was wont to offer, daily, out of his own property, a certain quantity of flour mixed with oil, baked a little, and divided into two parts, one of which he threw into the ſacred fire in the morning, the other in the evening †. This is certainly very ſimilar to the prieſt's *donative* in Exodus; yet I have ſtill ſome doubt of its being the ſame, and think that, in that caſe, the precept would have been expreſſed in other terms; at the ſame time acknowledging, that the conjecture of Roſenmüller is highly probable.

Ver. 21. *If the veſſel in which it is cooked be of earth, it ſhall be broken; if of copper, it ſhall be ſcoured.* I ſhall here only give Roſenmüller's note, with a ſingle remark on it.—"Moſes "vaſis æneis magis favet, quam teſtaceis, id quod nobis periculoſum videri poſſit, quum vaſa "ænea facilè ærugine induci ſoleant. Sed hoc periculum verendum non eſt, ubi vaſa illa

* "Mallem vertere *a die unctionis*, atque hæc verba intelligere de ſacrificio ſacerdotum, quod ipſi inde a die unctionis "ſuæ quotidie mane et veſpere offerre debuerunt. † Θυει δε ὁ ἱερευς εκ των ιδιων αναλωματων, και δις ἑκαστης ἡμερας τουτο ποιει, αλευρον ελαιῳ μεμαγμενον (al. μεμιγμενον), και πεπηγος οπτησει βραχεια .... τουτου δε το μεν ἡμισυ πρωι, το δε ἑτερον δειλης επιφερει τῳ πυρι. Ant. l. iii. c. 10. n. 7. p. 180.

"frequenter

" frequenter defricantur et aquâ eluuntur, utpote populo jam ex legibus Religionis munditiei " adſueto."—Tinned copper veſſels were not known to our anceſtors, and are yet unknown in ſome parts of the iſland; but great care is taken to ſcrub the inſide of copper and braſs pans and kettles with ſand and ſtraw, and then to waſh them clean with water; ſo that rarely any inconvenience happens from the uſe of them. A reaſon why Moſes ordered the earthenware to be broken, and the copper veſſels to be ſcoured, might be the ſuperior intrinſic value of the latter. It would have been bad economy to deſtroy every copper veſſel that had been defiled, when it could ſo readily be ſcoured from the impurity.

CHAP. VII.

THIS chap. in Sep. begins at ch. vii. ver. 11. except in Compl. which follows the Heb. diviſion.

Ver. 13. *With theſe, and with leavened bread beſides, ſhall he offer his euchariſtic ſacrifice.*—No part of this leavened bread was to be offered on the altar; it was only, like the firſt-fruits, a donation to the prieſts.

Ver. 15. The precept contained in this and the three following verſes ſeems to have had two ends in view—to promote health and encourage liberality. On the third day the meat would be ſtale, and conſequently unwholeſome; and by being obliged to eat all on the firſt or ſecond day, the poor would more readily come in for their ſhare.

Ver. 19. *Nor ſhall any perſon eat of the fleſh who is not clean.* There is here an apparent obſcurity in the original which runs thus: והבשר אשר יגע בכל טמא לא יאכל באש ישרף והבשר כל טהור יאכל בשר; thus rendered in our common verſion—" And the fleſh that toucheth any " unclean *thing* ſhall not be eaten, it ſhall be burned with fire: and as for the fleſh, all that " be clean ſhall eat thereof." Inſtead of " thereof," the original repeats *fleſh* thus—" And " the fleſh, every clean *perſon* ſhall eat fleſh:" or, if the reader like better Montanus's Latin, *et carnem, omnis mundus comedet carnem.* Sep. more briefly, πας καθαρος φαγεται κρεα. Did they read בשר only once? or did they ſuppreſs one?—Both are in the Heb. and Sam. texts, with very little variety of lection *; and indeed, in ſome ſhape or other, in all the ant. verſions, ſave Sep. The Greek of Venice is as literal as Montanus himſelf: και το κρεας, πας καθαρος εδεται κρεας. But what *fleſh* is here meant? Not ſurely the ſame fleſh that was juſt before ordered to be burned! Yet Jerom ſeems to have thought ſo, if his text have not been corrupted, as he renders the whole verſe thus: " *Caro, quæ aliquid tetigerit immundum, non* " *comedetur, ſed comburetur igni: qui fuerit mundus, veſcetur ex* EA:" rendered by the Douay tranſlators—" The fleſh that hath touched any unclean thing ſhall not be eaten, but ſhall be " burnt with fire: he that is clean ſhall eat thereof." This laſt word Dr. Chaloner changed into " of it," with the following note; " that is, of the fleſh of the thankſgiving."—This is indeed the explication which is given by Onkelos and the Thargumiſts, and almoſt all com-

* In one MS. והבשר is wanting, in another it is without the copulative, and in another without the prefix ה. One MS. has והבשכ כל; and another, ſtill more pleonaſtically, והבשר כל בשר.

mentators; but this idea is very badly expreſſed in the Latin Vulg.; and, even in the original, it is far from being clearly conveyed.

It was this that led Michaëlis to think that the order has been altered, and that we ſhould thus reſtore it: באש ישרפו הבשר: ver. 20. הנפש אשר, &c. The letters are all the ſame, only two copulatives have changed their places, and ver. 19 is ſuppoſed to end with הבשר. On this idea Michaëlis has formed his German verſion thus: "Wenn opferfleiſch von etwas unrei-"nem berührt würde, ſo ſoll es nicht gegeſſen, ſondern verbrannt werden. Jeder reine "kann vom fleiſch des *opfers* eſſen: wer aber, &c."—This emendation of the text is ingenious without being violent; yet to me it appears, in ſome degree, exceptionable; for, firſt, it will be allowed, I think, that ישרף is here more idiomatical than ישרפו, eſpecially as יאכל, not יאכלו, immediately precedes: ſecondly, if we point after הבשר, and refer it to the *fleſh* that was to be burned, it is a very uncommon conſtruction. We ſhould, in that ſuppoſition, have expected to find הזה after it. I am, therefore, prone to think that בשר, at the end of ver. 19. is an early interpolation; and that the 19th verſe ſhould end with ישרף. והבשר will then be naturally referred to the בשר זבח of ver. 18, and as naturally connected with ver. 20.—At any rate, either the הבשר or the בשר of ver. 19 muſt neceſſarily be referred to the fleſh of the ſacrifice itſelf, and not to that part of it which, from being defiled, was to be burned.

Ver. 21. *Or any unclean reptile.* The preſent text has כל שקץ; but the true reading ſeems to be כל שרץ, which is that of the Sam. text and verſion, and of 7 Heb. MSS. followed by Syr. Onk. Tharg. and Saad. and preferred by Houbigant and Michaëlis to the other reading; which, however, is that of Sep. Vulg. Perſ. Arab. Erp. * and Gr. Ven.: yet שקץ טמא looks ſo like a tautology †, that one is apt to think it could not be the original reading.

Ver. 24. *Ye ſhall eat none of the fat.* This precept muſt be limited. It refers only to ſuch parts of the fat as were to be offered to the Lord, as is explained ver. 25.

Ver. 35. *Such was the portion,* &c. I conſider this as a part of the hiſtorical narrative, and not of the foregoing injunction. For the reſt, the word which I render *portion*, משחת, is by Sep. rendered χρισις, by Vulg *unctio*; and ſo equivalently by all the antients, ſave Saadias, who, from his intimate acquaintance with the Arabic dialect, ſaw that ſuch a rendering was here unſuitable, and has very properly tranſlated הדה חצה הארץ. In fact, not only in Arab. but in Syr. Chald. and Sam. the word ſignifies a *meaſure*, or *portion*; and, perhaps, even in Heb. *unction* is but a ſecondary meaning of משח. However this be, it is here an improper meaning; as is clear from Num. 18. 8. where the Lord ſays to Aaron: "To thee alſo I "give the charge of mine heave-offerings, out of all the hallowed offerings of the children "of Iſrael: as an honorary portion, למשחה, I give them to thee:" where the Septuagint themſelves render למשחה by εις γερας. Here indeed Saadias has מסחא; but, I am perſuaded, in the ſame ſenſe with חצה, which he uſes in Exodus, although his Latin tranſlator has *ad unctionem*. In both places we might render *prerogative*; or, as Houbigant, *right*, *jus*.—Michaëlis has "theil," *ſhare*, *portion*, or *dole*, ſtill uſed in poetry. Dathe, more etymologically, *pars dimenſa*.

* By miſtake claſſed in my Var. Read. with thoſe who read שרץ; in lieu of which inſert Tharg. † The two words never elſewhere meet.

CHAP.

CHAP. VIII.

Ver. 3. *CONVOKE the whole aſſembly.* כל העדה. Sep. *πασαν την συναγωγην*—Vulg. *omnem cœtum.*—We are not however to imagine that this means the whole people of Iſrael, but only their deputies and repreſentatives; a real ſelect ſenate, or parliament. See Michaëlis's excellent diſſertation on this ſubject, in the firſt vol. of his *Moſaiſches Recht*, ſect. 45. p. 258 of the ſecond edition.

Ver. 7, 8. The order, I think, has been ſomewhat deranged. By the aid of three MSS. and P. P. Exod. 29. 5, 6. I would thus reſtore it—ויתן עליו את הכיתנת ׳ ויחגר אתו באבנט ׳ וילבש אתו את המעיל ויתן עליו את האפיד ואת החשן ׳ויחגר אתו בחשב האפוד ׳ויתן אל החשן את האורים ואת התומים. —This order I have followed in my verſion; but, that my reader may have alſo the preſent order before him, I ſhall here give it in the words of our common tranſlation: "And he put "upon him the coat, and girded him with the girdle, and clothed him with the robe, and "put the ephod upon him; and he girded him with the curious girdle of the ephod, and "bound *it* unto him therewith. And he put the breaſt-plate upon him: alſo he put upon "the breaſt-plate the Urim and Thummim."—The principal miſtranſlations here have been elſewhere noticed*; I will only add, that the עליו before את האפיד, in ver. 7, ſhould, in my opinion, be rendered, not *upon him*, but *upon it*; i. e. *over the ephod*, as Jerom has well expreſſed it—*et deſuper humerale impoſuit.*

Ver. 33. *From the door of the convention-tent ye ſhall not depart*, &c. "Not the door of "the tabernacle," ſay Dathe and Roſenmüller, "but the door of the court."—Why ſo?—"Becauſe it was not permitted for the prieſts to ſleep, nor even ſit down, within the taber-"nacle."—True; but they who watched *at the door*, and not within the door, could not be ſaid either to ſit or ſleep in the tabernacle; they were to remain, not at the door of the court, but in the court, at the door of the tabernacle, during the ſeven days of their *initiation.*

CHAP. IX.

Ver. 24. *NOW the glory of the Lord had appeared.* ויראו כבוד יהוה. I render יראו in the preterperfect tenſe, becauſe the appearance, no doubt, was made when the firſt holocauſt was burned, and before Aaron came down from the altar. Many things in the Hebrew volumes are related not juſt in their proper place, as every ſcholar knows.

* See C. R. on Exod. 28. 8.

CHAP.

CHAP. X.

Ver. 2. *A FLAME emitted from the Lord*; that is, a flaſh of lightning. Ib. *Devoured them.* This word is too ſtrong, as well as *conſumed* in our common verſion. That they were not *conſumed*, appears from ver. 4, where Miſhael and Elizaphan are ordered to "carry them "out of the camp, from before the ſanctuary."

Ver. 9. *Neither wine, nor any thing inebriating.* יין ושכר. Sep. οινον και σικερα *—Vulg. *vinum*, et *omne quod inebriare poteſt*: and ſo equivalently Onk. Tharg. Saad. Perſ.—Syr. and Erp. retain the Heb. and Greek word, σικερα.—From Herodotus † we learn that the Egyptians, inſtead of wine, which their country produced not, made a ſtrong drink out of barley. The ſame thing is atteſted by Diodorus Siculus. Among the Jews, שכר was uſed to denote every ſort of inebriating liquor, whether it were made out of grain, or the juice of fruits, or a compoſition of honey and water, which we call *mead* ‡.

Ver. 14. *In a clean place.* That is, in any place not defiled by any legal impurity.

CHAP. XI.

AS Spencer and Michaëlis have largely treated on the probable motives which induced the Hebrew legiſlator to enact the laws mentioned in this chapter, I ſhall ſay little on the ſubject. I ſhall only obſerve, that all nations have a natural averſion to the eating of ſome beaſts and birds, and which in their eyes may be ſaid to be unclean: and I believe there is not one in the Moſaic catalogue which any of us would eat without ſome great urgency §. It is not, indeed, eaſy to ſay what are the particular ſpecies here proſcribed, and therefore the beſt I can do, I think, is to give, firſt, my own verſion, and then the Heb. Greek, Latin, and other correſponding names, with a few notes, where they ſeem neceſſary, at the bottom of the page.

UNCLEAN QUADRUPEDS.

Ver. 4. *The camel.* Heb. with both Arabs, גמל—Sep. and Gr. Ven. καμηλος—Vulg. *camelus*—Onk. Tharg. Syr. גמלא—Perſ. שתר.—There is no doubt of this being the *camel*, including the *dromedary*.

* Gr. Ven. συρμαιον. † Euterp. c. 76. ‡ "Cicera, hebraico ſermone, omnis potio quæ inebriare "poteſt; ſiva illa quæ frumento conficitur, ſive pomorum ſuccu, aut cum favi decoquuntur in dulcem et barbaram "potionem, aut palmarum fructus exprimuntur in liquorem, coctiſque frugibus aqua pinguior coloratur." Hieron. ad Nepot. Op. tom. 4. p. 364. ed. Bened.—So Theophylactus (ad Luc. i. v. 15) Σικερα λεγεται παν το μεθην εμποιειν δυναμενον, απ ον δε εξ αμπελου.—See Suiceri *Theſaur. Eccleſiaſt.* tom. 11. p. 958.—Among the Arabs, סבר and מסברא ſeem chiefly to denote *date-wine*. § The remark of a Greek Father is here to the purpoſe: Ἡ κοινη φυσις πολλακις προλαβουσα [τον νομον] εδδελυξατο τα μεν δια το μεγεθος, τα δε δια το δυσειδες, τα δε δια το νεκρων απογευσασθαι, τα δε κατα προλεψιν μισους. Ὁσα ουν προελαβεν ἡ συνηθεια, ουκ ανετρεψεν ὁ νομος. Euſeb. Emiſen. In Caten. apud Montfaucon, vol. i. p. 120.

Ver. 5.

Ver. 5. *The bear-mouſe.* Heb. and Tharg. שפן—Sep. δασυπους *—Vulg. *chærogryllus*—Onk. טפוא †—Syr. חגסא ‡—Saad. ובר §—Erp. פנך ||—Perſ. בּוֹנכרה—Gr. Ven. εχινος.—Moſt modern tranſlators have, after Pagninus and Luther, taken it to be the *rabbit*, or *coney*. So all our Engliſh tranſlators, ſave thoſe who tranſlated from the Vulgate, namely, Wiclif, and the Douay tranſlators, who retain the Latin word *cherogril*.—That the שפן cannot be the coney is now pretty generally agreed, both becauſe the coney is not a ruminating animal, and becauſe it dwells not in the rocks, as the שפן is ſaid to do, Pſalm 104. 18. and Prov. 30. 26. the only other places where the word occurs, except in Deut. 14. 7. where it muſt have the ſame meaning as here. It is now generally believed to be the *mus-jaculus*, *pedibus poſticis longiſſimis*, *caudâ villosâ*, thus deſcribed by Haſſelquiſt: "This animal is of the ſize of a "large mouſe: it ſupports itſelf only on its hind legs, and therefore hops or jumps in its "progreſſive motion. When it reſts, it cloſes its feet to its belly, and ſits on its knees bent. "It holds its victuals with its fore feet or paws, as do the reſt of this tribe. It is fond of "ſleep; ſleeping in the day, and waking at night. It eats wheat, bread, and the ſeeds of "ſeſamum. Though it is not much afraid of man, yet it is not eaſily tamed: for this "reaſon it is always kept in a cage; and I have known one of theſe animals kept for ſome "months, and even a year, in this manner, at Cairo. It is met with in Egypt, or between "Egypt and Arabia. The Arabians call it *Garbuka*, [it ſhould be *Ierbua*, ירבוע]: but the "French who live in Egypt call it *Rat de Montagne* ¶."—Michaëlis renders it "die bergmaus "mit langen hinterfüſſen," *the mountain-mouſe with long hinder-feet*; Dathe, *mus urſinus*; which I have adopted in my verſion.

Ver. 6. *The hare.* Heb. and Tharg. ארנבת—Sep. χοιρογριλλιος **—Vulg. *lepus*—Onk. and Syr. ארנבא—Both Arabs, ארנבה ††—Perſ. הַרכוש—Gr. Ven. λαγωος.—All are agreed that this is the *hare*. It has been, indeed, objected, that the *hares* do *not* ruminate; but this is yet doubtful. At any rate they ſeem to ruminate, and this was ſufficient for the Heb. legiſlator, who probably was not a great naturaliſt, like Solomon.

Ver. 7. The *ſwine*. Heb. חזיר—Sep. ὑς—Vulg. *ſus*—Onk. Syr. and Tharg. חזירא—Both Arabs, חנזיר—Perſ. חוך (our very Engliſh *hog*)—Gr. Ven. χοιρος, a profane name for the ſame animal.—All allow that it is the *ſwine*, or, as we now term it, *hog*.

Theſe are the only quadrupeds, which are ſpecially named as unclean; but the general rule, in ver. 3. includes a vaſt number indeed; and therefore it was not neceſſary to mention them. Nor was it neceſſary to mention any particular fiſh, as a general rule is laid down

* So Ald. Vat. Alex. Glaſg. Leipſ. Canon.; but Compl. and MS. Sar. have here χοιρογρυλλιος, and δασυπους in the next verſe, and this appears from Vulg. to have been the primitive order. † This word denotes *the jumper*, and is commonly rendered *cuniculus*; but I believe it is the *mus jaculus*. ‡ Rendered in Pol. *cuniculus*, but by Ferrarius *herenaceus*. § Is thus deſcribed by Forſkal: "Feli ſimilis, ſine cauda, herbiphagus, monticola. Cairo, "incolis edulis." || Gives alſo the notion of *jumping*. It is rendered by Walton *muſtela, fovina*.
¶ Haſſelquiſt, Engliſh verſion, p. 168. See alſo Bochart, Hieroz. pars i. l. 3. c. 33.; and Harmer, vol. iv. p. 166, who is inclined to think that שפן is the animal deſcribed by Shaw, called *Daman-Iſrael*. ** But here Compl. and MS. Sar. have δασυπους. See the note on ver. 5. †† It is written by Forſkal ערנב, with an *ain*; but ארנב by Ruſſel, who remarks that at Aleppo the *hare* and the *rabbit* are called by the ſame name. They are not forbidden to be eaten by the Mohammedan Arabs.

with

with reſpect to them in ver. 9—12. But a more particular ſpecification was thought requiſite of the birds, inſects, and reptiles, that were to be accounted unclean.

UNCLEAN BIRDS.

Ver. 13. *The eagle.* Heb. נשר—Sep. and Gr. Ven. *αετος*—Vulg. *aquila*—Onk. and Syr. נשרא—Tharg. נישרא—Sam. ver. נשרה—Both Arabs, נסר—Perſ. كَرگَس, rendered in Pol. *gryps*, but in the Perſic Goſpel of Matthew it is put for the Greek *αετος*. It is certain that it is the *eagle*; but whether it denote the whole aquiline genus, or any particular ſpecies, it is hard to ſay.

Ib. *The vulture.* Heb. פרס—Sep. *γρυψ* *—Vulg. *gryps*—Onk. ער—Tharg. עזא—Syr. דיתא—Sam. verſ. בזאה—Both Arabs, עקאב—Perſ. موشيرة †—Gr. Ven. *ἁλιαετος*.—All the Oriental names ſeem to be derived from *roots* that ſignify *ſtrength of body* or *ſtrength of claws*, or *rapacity*; except the ער of Onk. which denotes *naked*, and leads us to that ſpecies of vulture called by Buffon *vultur fulvus*, of which there is a fine ſpecimen, I think, in Parkinſon's Muſeum.—In our common tranſlation פרס is rendered *oſſifrage*, and by Dathe *oſſifraga*; by Michaëlis, "der kleine ſchwarz-braune adler," *the little black-brown eagle.*

Ib. *The oſpray*, or rather *oſprey.* Heb. עזניה—Sep. *ἁλιαετος*—Vulg. *haliæetus*—Onk. עזיא Tharg. בר־נוא—Syr. *caret*—Sam. ver. עזזה—Both Arabs, عنقا—Perſ. موشبيرة—Gr. Ven. *γυψ*.—Etymology leads to think that it derives its name from the *impetuoſity* with which it ſeizes its prey: even the compound uſed by Jonathan, בר נוא, may be rendered *the ſon of feſtination*, from the meaning which נוא ſtill retains in Æthiopic.—Our firſt Engliſh tranſlators rendered it *cormorant*, our laſt *oſpray*.—Dathe, *valeria*.—Michaëlis: "der meer-adler," the *ſea-eagle*.—All this, however, is but probable conjecture.

Ver. 14. *The falcon.* Heb. דאה—Sep. *γυψ*—Vulg. *milvus*—Onk. דיתא—Tharg. דייתא—Syr. *caret*—Sam. ver. דאיתה—Both Arabs, חדאה—Perſ. ماهي‌خوار ‡—Gr. Ven. *ἰβις*: he ſeems to have had the ſame idea with the Perſic tranſlator.—All the other Oriental terms depend on the Heb. word דאה or דיה, which occurs only here and again in Deut. 14. 13. and in Iſa. 34. 15. But as it occurs four times as a verb §, and in all thoſe places it evidently ſignifies to *fly ſwiftly* ||, it appears to me extremely probable that the *falcon* (*avis perniciſſima*) is deſignated.—Our common verſion has *vulture*.—Dathe, *milvus*. Michaëlis, "der habicht," *the falcon.*

Ib. *Kites, according to their kinds.* Heb. איה—Sep. *ικτινος*, or *ικτιν*—Vulg. *vultur*—Onk. טרפית—Tharg. טרפתא—Syr. *caret*—Sam. Ver. אהיה—Both Arabs, צדי—Perſ. هنده, *noctua*—Gr. Ven. *κωλιος*.—From Hebrew etymology nothing is here to be learned. The Chaldee terms give only the general idea of *rapaciouſneſs*, which perfectly agrees with the *kite*, who has been known to ſnatch fiſh out of the public markets, and even out of the hands of fiſh-women.

* All, ſave Alex. which hath *γυψ*. See the note on ver. 5. † *Accipiter fringillarius.* ‡ The *fiſh-picker.*

§ Deut. 28. 49; Pſ. 18. 10; Jerem. 48. 40. and 49. 22. || Particularly in that beautiful metaphor, Pſ. 18. 10.: "On a cherub he rode, and flew; he glided on wings of wind."—From this ſame idea the falcon (at leaſt one ſpecies of falcon) is called the *glede*; a term uſed by our Engliſh tranſlators to expreſs a word in Deut. written ראה, but which I am perſuaded ſhould be דאה, as it is in Sam. and at leaſt 3 Heb. MSS. See C. R. on the place.

Hence

Hence Plautus, ſomewhere, calls a raviſher *milous*. The Syriac name denotes a bird of *great flight*; and this, too, ſuits the *kite*, who flies as high as any bird except the *falcon*, and balances himſelf in the air with greater eaſe than any other flying creature, the motion of his wings being hardly perceptible.

Ver. 15.* *Ravens of every kind.* Heb. and Sam. ver. ערב—Sep. and Gr. Ven. κορακ—Vulg. *omne corvini generis*—Onk. and Tharg. עורבא—Syr. נעבא—Saad. ערבא—Perſ. כלאע—Erp. עראב.—This is undoubtedly the *raven*. The Scottiſh name *corby*, the French *corbeau*, and the Latin *corvus*, are evidently derived from the Hebrew.

Ver. 16. *The oſtrich.* Heb. בת־היענה—Sep. στρουθος—Vulg. *ſtruthio*—Onk. and Tharg. בת־נעמיתא—Syr. נעמא—Sam. ver. ברת־ענית—Saad. נעאם—Erp. בנת־נעאמה—Perſ. شترمرغ—Gr. Ven. πορφυριων.—There is very little doubt of its being the *oſtrich*. The Arabic נעאמה is ſtill, at Aleppo and in Barbary, the name for that bird. See Ruſſel and Shaw†.

Ib. *The owl.* Heb. תחמס—Sep. γλαυξ—Vulg. *noctua*—Onk. ציצא—Tharg. חטפיתא—Syr. *caret*—Sam. ver. טעיוה——Both Arabs, חטאף—Perſ. باشه‡—Gr. Ven. καταρακτης.—It is very uncertain what bird this is. The Hebrew name implies only the general idea of *rapacity*: nor do the other Oriental names aid us to particulariſe the ſpecies. From the name given to it in Tharg. I was once inclined to think it might be the *ſnipe*, whoſe voice is well repreſented by חטכית§; and the ציצא of Onk. ſeems to denote ſome clamorous bird, which the *ſnipe* is above all others, except, perhaps, the *lapwing*.—Dathe, *birundo*—Michaëlis, "die eule‖."

Ib. *The horn-owl.* Heb. שחף—Sep. λαρος—Vulg. *larus*—Onk. צפר־שחפא—Syr. *caret*—Sam. ver. שופה—Both Arabs, סאף—Perſ. شاهين—Gr. Ven. εφιαλτης, *the night-mare*: a ſtrange term indeed for a bird.—The Heb. word occurs only twice in an appellative ſenſe, and in both places ſignifies *conſumption*. In Chald. it has a ſimilar meaning¶, and the other Oriental terms here uſed to expreſs the Hebrew name have a like import. But this well agrees with the *horn-owl*, who, although a great glutton, is perhaps the leaneſt of all birds. By our laſt Engliſh tranſlators it is rendered cuckow, but *ſea-mew* by Gen. and *ſea-gull* by Ainſworth. So Dathe, *larus*; and Michaëlis, "meeve;" all after the Septuagint and Vulgate. I am much inclined to think it is the *horn-owl*, and have ſo rendered it; yet one thing makes me doubt—Dr. Ruſſel tells us, that, at Aleppo, אלסאפי is a hawk uſed in antelope and hare chaſing. Now this word appears to be the ſame with סאף, uſed by both Arabs to expreſs the Heb. שחף: and the Sam. ver. has a ſimilar word, שופה. Still all is conjecture; and perhaps it would be as well to ſtick to the good old Septuagint, and render *the ſea-gull***.

After *horn-owl*, in my verſion, is found *the howlet*, which how it came in there, I hardly know; but I think it muſt have ariſen from a doubt which I then had, whether שחף meant

* In Sep. Ald. Rom. and Alex. this is ver. 16; but Compl. Glaſg. Leipſ. and Can. follow the order of the Hebrew. † In our common verſion it is rendered the *owl*, but *oſtrich* by our firſt tranſlators. ‡ The *ſparrow-hawk*. § *Hatfit*, or *hackfit*, is the common name of a ſnipe in the north of Scotland. ‖ That is, the *owl*. In our common verſion it is the *night-hawk*. ¶ So the Arab. סחף, among other meanings, has that of *thin, lean, emaciated*. ** Only it is not probable that a water-bird ſhould be brought in among the land-birds of prey. The learned reader will examine, and chooſe.

the *howlet* or the *horn-owl*; and both, being marked in my *foul* copy, were inadvertently tranſcribed into the *fair* one. I am not, now, ſure that *howlet* is not the preferable word, for the ſame etymological reaſons are equally in its favour. The beſt way then to correct my text will be, to efface the *horn-owl*, and leave the marks of reference where they are. It is remarkable that the Sam. copies, both here and in Deut. have למינו after שדף, and not after the next name, נץ, as in Heb.

Ib. *Hawks of every kind.* Heb. נץ—Sep. ἱέραξ—Vulg. *accipiter*—Onk. and Syr. נצא—Tharg. and Sam. verſ. נצצה—Both Arabs, באז—Perſ. באז—Gr. Ven. *caret*.—It is pretty generally agreed that this is the *hawk*, but queſtioned of what particular ſpecies. This appears to me to be a needleſs queſtion, when hawks of every ſort are forbidden. The word נץ then muſt be a generical term, and moſt probably ſignifies the *hawk*. Niebuhr indeed ſays that the Arabic word באז, or the Perſic באז, in Arabia, is at preſent the name for the *falcon*; but this is not ſufficient to induce a belief that the Heb. word is to be ſo limited.

Ver. 17. *The cormorant.* Heb. and Tharg. כוס—Sep. νυκτικόραξ—Vulg. *bubo*—Onk. קדיא—Syr. עודא—Sam. ver. צדיה—Both Arabs and Perſ. בום—Gr. Ven. γλαυξ.—In our com. ver. this is rendered *the ſwan*—by Dathe *otus*—by Michaëlis *nacht-rabe*.—Bochart thought it was the *onocratalus*, or *bittourn*; and ſo Bate renders. I conjecture it to be *the cormorant*; yet the Arabic and Perſic names ſtagger me. Ruſſel ſays, that, at Aleppo, בומה, evidently the ſame with בום *, is the *eagle-owl*; but it is ſtill a queſtion whether the Arabic and Perſic tranſlators rightly rendered the Heb. term.

Ib. *The ſea-gull* †. Heb. שלך—Sep. καταρακτης—Vulg. *mergulus*—Onk. Tharg. Syr. שלינונא—Sam. ver. תיבי—Both Arabs, זמג—Perſ. עכה—Gr. Ven. πελεκας.—That this is a *plungeing* bird, I have little doubt. Some modern critics think it is the *Pelecanus Baſſanus* of Linnæus. The Chald. and Syr. verſion, שלינונא, *fiſh-catcher*, favours this rendering; nor leſs the Greek καταρακτης, which, according to Ariſtotle, draws for its food fiſhes from the bottom of the ſea ‡.

Ib. *The ibis.* Heb. ינשוף—Sep. ἴβις—Vulg. *ibis*—Onk. Tharg. and Syr. קפופא—Sam. ver. ברברי—Both Arabs, באשק—Perſ. לכלך—Gr. Ven. κορωνη.—That this is the *ibis* I think is highly probable, both on the authority of Sep. and even from the etymon of the Heb. word, which in Syr. ſignifies *mundus*, *purus*. Now it is a peculiar property in the *ibis* never to drink but *pure* and *clear* water: hence the Egyptian prieſts are ſaid to have bathed themſelves in ſuch places as they had obſerved the *ibis* to drink in §. Our public verſion has here *the great owl*; Bate, the *twilight-bird*; Dathe, *noctua*; Michaëlis, *das käutzgen*.

Ver.

* It has even been ſurmiſed that this was originally the Heb. word. It is ſaid that ſome MSS. have בוס inſtead of כוס; but I find no ſuch reading either in Kennicott or De Roſſi. There is, indeed, no impoſſibility of בוסם having been, by an ignorant or careleſs tranſcriber, converted into בום, or even כוס; yet it is not probable, as all the Sam. copies here agree with Heb. † In my text there is a tranſpoſition here; the *ibis* is wrongly placed before the *ſea-gull*. ‡ Our common verſion has *the cormorant*; Bate, *the plongeon*; Dathe, *mergulus*; Michaëlis, "der "täucher." § The *ibis* is thus deſcribed by Haſſelquiſt: "It is of the ſize of a raven-hen, and is ſeen in great "numbers, during the overflowing of the Nile, in thoſe places which the water does not reach, and afterwards in the "places which the water has deſerted. It feeds on inſects and ſmall frogs, which abound in Egypt during the inun-"dation of the Nile, and for ſome time after, being by this means of great ſervice to the country. They often aſſem-"ble,

Ver. 18. *The ſwan* *. Heb. תנשמת—Sep. πορφυριων—Vulg. *cygnus*—Onk. כותא—Tharg. אותיא—Syr. כוכבי—Sam. ver. קפיפי—Both Arabs, שאדין—Perſ. ברסתך—Gr. Ven. ερωδιος.—It is extremely uncertain what bird this is. Hence Dathe and Michaëlis have retained the Heb. name, the *tinghemeth*.—Bochart's conjecture that it is the *owl*, *noctua*, is not at all probable. Bate thought it was *the cormorant*; and obſerves, that "this, and ſeveral other water-fowls, "are remarkable for *blowing* out a particular note or noiſe."—He alludes to the root נשם, which ſignifies to *breathe*, *reſpire*, &c. If etymology were here to be made a guide, I would rather ſay that it points to a well-known quality in the ſwan, that of being able to *reſpire* a long time with its bill and neck entirely under water, and even plunged in the mud.

Ib. *The pelican*. Heb. קאת—Sep. πελεκας—Vulg. *onocratalus*—Onk. קתא—Tharg. and Syr. ככא—Sam. ver. קאתיך—Saad. קיק—Erp. and Perſ. קוק—Gr. Ven. *caret*.—This bird is generally, and with much probability, thought to be the *pelican*. Some have taken it for the *cuckow*, led, perhaps, by the Arab. and Perſic name. From Heb. etymology we here derive no help; but the Arabic קאת, *aluit*, ſeems to point out the attention with which the pelican *feeds* and *nurſes* its young.

Ib. *The ſtork*. Heb. רחם—Sep. κυκνος—Vulg. *porphyrio*—Onk. רקרקא—Tharg. and Syr. שרקרקא—Sam. ver. נעמיתה—Saad. רחם—Erp. רחמה—Perſ. בلبل, certainly *the nightingale*. Gr. Ven. *caret*.—From the well-known filial and parental *affection* of the *ſtork*, and from the name being here placed immediately after the pelican, I was led to believe that רחם ought to be rendered *the ſtork*; I am now convinced that my conjecture was ill-founded.—From Dr. Ruſſel we learn, that at Aleppo the *vultur perenopterus* of Linnæus is called רחמי, which is evidently the ſame name with the Heb. רחם, and the Arab. רחמה. Yet it is not eaſy to conceive how ſuch a bird as this could derive its name from רחם, which is certainly more proper to expreſs the manners of the ſtork †.

Ver. 19. There is here an omiſſion of one name in my verſion. Read then thus: "the "heron and anaphas of every kind."—And now, firſt, of

The heron. Heb. חסידה—Sep. ερωδιος ‡—Vulg. *herodio*—Onk. חוריתא—Tharg. דיתא־חוורתא Syr. חורכא—Sam. ver. זנוניתה—Saad. צקר—Erp. סקר—Perſ. سفيد.—From the radical meaning of the Heb. word חסד, this has alſo been ſuppoſed to denote the ſtork, "*a* στοργη *naturali, et* "*charitatis affectu erga parentes*."—The Oriental tranſlators ſeem to have taken it for a ſpecies of *kite*, or falcon. Perhaps the Arab. סקר is the French *ſacre*, *falco ſacer*. But where every thing is ſo uncertain, it is better to hold by the Septuagint, and the other Greek interpreters, followed by Vulg.

"ble, particularly mornings and evenings, in the gardens, in ſuch numbers as to cover the palm-trees. When this bird "reſts it ſits *upright*, ſo as to cover its feet with its tail, and raiſes the breaſt and neck." From this upright poſture of the *ibis*, a ſtaunch etymologiſt would draw another argument; for קף, or קפף, in Arab. ſignifies *erect*; and קמופא is the Chald. and Syr. rendering of ינשוף. But much ſtreſs is not to be laid on ſuch round-about *etyma*. * There is here again a miſtake in the text of my verſion; *pelican* is before *ſwan*, whereas it ſhould follow it. † The *vultur perenopterus* is thus deſcribed by Haſſelquiſt, p. 194: "The appearance of this bird is as horrid as can well be "imagined. The face is naked and wrinkled; the eyes are large and black; the beak black and crooked, the talons "large, and extended ready for prey; and the whole body polluted with filth: qualities enough to make the beholders "ſhudder with horror."—No wonder that ſuch an animal ſhould be deemed unclean. ‡ So alſo Aquila, Theodotion, and the Greek of Venice.

Ib. *Anaphas of every kind.* I have not rendered the word אנפה, becauſe I have no conception of its meaning, any more than of the word χαραδριος *, by which it is rendered in Sep. and Vulg. Were we to lean upon etymology, we ſhould call it ſome *angry, furious* bird; and ſo it is rendered by Montanus, *avis furibunda.* The other verſions are: Onk. אבו—Tharg. אבמתא—Syr. אנפא, the Heb. word—Sam. ver. עמפיתה—Saad. בבגא—Erp. בבנה—Perſ. בותמאר—Gr. Ven. θυμοτρις †—In our com. verſ. it is *the heron,* but, in our more ant. tranſlations, *the jay.*—Some think it is the *plover.*—In ſhort, all is mere conjecture.

Ib. *The hoopoop.* Heb. דוכיפת ‡—Sep. εποψ—Vulg. *upupa*—Onk. and Tharg. נגר־טורא, *the mountain-cock*—Syr. תרנגול־כרא; of the ſame import, according to ſome lexicographers; but the *hoopop,* according to Bahr-balul, in Caſtell.—Sam. ver. נקתראה—Both Arabs, הדהד—Perſ. שאנהסר—Gr. Ven. αγριαι λεκτορις.—It is, moſt probably, the *hoopop,* or *lapwing,* which Pliny calls an obſcene bird §.

Ib. *The bat.* Heb. עטלף—Sep. νυκτερις—Vulg. *veſpertilio*—Onk. עהלפא; the Heb. word Chaldaized—Syr. תומא, *pavo*—Tharg. טרפורא—Sam. ver. ערפדה—Both Arabs, הפאש—Perſ. שב־ברך—Gr. Ven. νυκτερις.—So that, on the whole, we may almoſt certainly conclude this to be *the bat.*

Here, then, are twenty different birds, forbidden to be eaten by the Moſaical law; and no doubt, at that time, they were all well known by diſtinguiſhing characters: ſome, perhaps, were peculiar to Egypt and Arabia; but unleſs ſome intelligent perſon and good grammarian reſiding for a conſiderable time in thoſe regions, and learning from the inhabitants the various vulgar names of every indigenous bird, take the trouble to make a comparative nomenclature of them, we ſhall never arrive at any thing like certainty with reſpect to their real names. For the ſake of thoſe who wiſh to explore this matter, as far as a general knowledge gathered from Lexicons, or other Oriental compoſitions, can enable one, I have been at ſome pains to exhibit, in no enormous ſpace, the renderings of the antient verſions; by comparing which with one another, and with the original, ſome conſiderable light may yet be thrown on the ſubject by the united efforts of philologiſts; who ſhould communicate, one to another, what particular remarks they may have made.

Ver. 20. *Every flying creature which crawleth on four feet,* &c. This is a general precept, including every winged animal which hath more than two feet, except thoſe mentioned in the next two verſes.

Ver. 22. *The arba.* Heb. ארבה—Sep. βρουχος—Vulg. *bruchus*—Onk. and Tharg. and Sam. ver. גובא—Syr. קמצא—Both Arabs, גראד—Gr. Ven. ακρις—Our com. ver. "the locuſt."—It is ſuppoſed, with no ſmall probability, to be the *gryllus gregarius* of Forſkal, or the common gregarious *locuſt,* which the Arabs call גראד, *djerad*; and which the Jews who dwell in Yemen aſſured Forſkal is the ſame with the Heb. ארבה.

Ib. *The ſolam.* Heb. and Perſ. סלעם—Sep. αττακη—Vulg. *attacus*—Onk. Tharg. and Sam. ver. רשונא—Syr. *caret*—Saad. דבא—Erp. ראשן—Gr. Ven. παρνοψ—Our Engliſh ver-

* It is ſuppoſed to be the *Egyptian dotterell.* † He ſeems to have had a wiſh to expreſs the literal meaning of the Heb. and invented a term for the purpoſe, of the ſame meaning with θυμωδης, *animated, angry.*

‡ So Heb.; but Sam. has רגיפת, 5 Sam. MSS. have דוגפת, 2 דוגיפת, 1 רגפית, and 1 דוגפית. One Heb. MS. has דוכיפית.

§ "Upupa obſcœna paſtu avia." Plin. 10. 36.

ſion,

ſion, " the bald locuſt."—Bate, *the rock-bred locuſt.*—It is ſuppoſed to be the *gryllus everſor.*

Ib. *The hargol.* Heb. Syr. both Arabs, and Perſ. חרגל—Sep. οφιομαχη—Vulg. *ophiomachus*—Onk. חרגולא—Tharg. ניפולא—Sam. ver. רגולה—Gr. Ven. αττελαβος—In our common ver. " the beetle."—Bate: the *adder-ſpear.*—It is ſuppoſed to be the *gryllus verrucivorus* of Linnæus.

Ib. *The hagab.* Heb. and Perſ. הגב—Onk. חגבא—Tharg. כרזבא—Syr. *caret*—Sam. ver. חרגבה—Gr. Ven. *caret*—Our com. ver. " *the graſhopper*"—Bate, *the hagab.*—It is ſuppoſed to be the *gryllus coronatus* of Linnæus*.

Michaëlis was of opinion that the four names above were only one inſect, at different periods of its exiſtence, and in his German verſion thus renders the colon: " Die heu-" ſchrecken nach der erſten, zweiten, dritten, und vierten häutung †"—But this, in my opinion, is highly improbable, and repugnant to the text, which adds למינו after every one of the four inſects. This alone deſtroys Michaëlis's conjecture.—We now come to

UNCLEAN REPTILES ‡.

Ver. 29. *The mole.* Heb. and Saad. חלד—Sep. γαλη—Vulg. *muſtela*—Onk. חולדא—Tharg. כרפושתא §—Syr. ככושתא; the ſame word, but differently ſpelled—Arab. Erp. כלד; ח changed into כ—Sam. ver. חלדה; the Heb. word Samaritanized—Perſ. כרבה—Gr. Ven. μυγαλη.—I have no doubt of its being *the mole*; for which, at this day, חֹלד is the name at Aleppo. See Ruſſel.

Ib. *The mouſe.* Heb. עכבר—Sep. μυς—Vulg. *mus*—Onk. and Tharg. עכברא—Syr. עוכברא—Sam. ver. ענברה—Both Arabs, פאר—Perſ. מוש—Gr. Ven. μυς.—There is no doubt of this being *the mouſe.*

Ib. *The land-crocodile.* Heb. and both Arabs, צב—Sep. κροκοδειλος ὁ χερσαιος—Vulg. *crocodilus*—Onk. צבא—Tharg. סמוקא—Syr. חרדנא—Sam. ver. ערדונה—Perſ. ראסו—Gr. Ven. αιλουρος.—When I wrote my verſion, I had little doubt of this being the *land-crocodile*, the σκιγκος of Dioſcorides, and the *ſcincus* of Pliny; but on comparing Forſkal with Haſſelquiſt, I am inclined to think that the animal here forbidden is the *lacerta cordylus* of Linnæus ‖.

Ver. 30. *The newt.* Heb. and Tharg. אנקה—Sep. μυγαλη—Vulg. *mygale*—Onk. ילא—Syr. אמקתא—Sam. ver. סממיתה—Saad. ורך—Erp. ורל—Perſ. סמור—Gr. Ven. χαμαιλεων.—This is ſuppoſed to be the *lizard of the Nile* ¶.

Ib. *The green lizard.* Heb. כח—Sep. χαμαιλεων—Vulg. *chamæleon*—Onk. כוחא—Tharg. כחא—Syr. חולדא—Sam. ver. כחה—Both Arabs, חרדון—Perſ. סוֹסנא—Gr. Ven. σαυραι.—The name of this animal ſeems to be derived from its *ſtrength.* In fact, the *green lizard* is

* See Tychſen's Comment. *De locuſtis Biblicis*, printed at Roſtock in 1787. † *The locuſt, in its firſt, ſecond, third, and fourth ſtate.* ‡ In Hebrew the word *reptile* is more extenſive than in modern languages.
§ Miſprinted in Pol. ברכושתא. ‖ By Haſſelquiſt deſcribed thus: " Cauda verticillata, ſquamis denticulatis, " pedibus penta-dactylis."—By Forſkal thus: " *Femora* teretia, ſine verrucis, *cauda* verticillata non longa; *ſquamæ* " patentes, ſubconicæ, mucronatæ: *corpus* nudum rugoſum." ¶ " Lacerta nilotica, cauda tereti longa, " corpore toto glabro, ſquamis angulo obtuſo notatis." Haſſelquiſt, p. 221. It is met with in the moiſt places of Egypt, near the Nile.

three

three times bigger than the common grey lizard. It appears to be the *lacerta ſtellio* of Linnæus *.

Ib. *The red lizard.* Heb. לטאה—Sep. χαλαβωτης—Vulg. *ſtellio*—Onk. חלטתא—Tharg. שממיתא—Syr. צרוריתא—Sam. ver. לטעיתה—Both Arabs, עצאה—Perſ. נו—Gr. Ven. σαυροπεδρα.—Bochart has made it very probable that this is a ſpecies of red lizard, called by the Arabs *wachra*, וחרה †. Some take it to be the *ſalamander*; to which perhaps it has ſome reſemblance in ſhape and ſize, although not in colour.

Ib. *The ſnail.* Heb. חמט—Sep. σαυρα—Vulg. *lacerta*—Onk. חומטא—Tharg. קיציצא—Syr. חולמתא—Sam. ver. קכדה—Both Arabs, חרבא—Perſ. סוסמאר—Gr. Ven. φερουσος.—Bochart labours to prove that this is another ſpecies of lizard, called by the Arabs *chulaca*, חלכא, which is ſaid to live in the ſand; but his arguments are more ſpecious than ſolid. Etymology is evidently againſt him, but favours the *ſnail.* In Chald. חמט ſignifies *incurvation, in ſe reflectere.*—The principal Jewiſh rabbies, and the maſs of modern interpreters, have *ſnail.*

Ib. *The chameleon.* Heb. תנשמת—Sep. ασπαλαξ—Vulg. *talpa*—Onk. אשותא—Tharg. סמנדרא—Syr. ידידא—Sam. ver. כששתה—Saad. סאם־אברץ—Erp. צנברץ—Perſ. כרבהדלה—Gr. Ven. ασπαλαγξ.—I am inclined to think, with Bochart, that this is the *chameleon.* Here etymology is particularly favourable: *reſpiration* is ſo applicable to the chameleon, that it is ſaid to live on air ‡. However, ſome modern critics think that תנשמת is not the *chameleon*, but the *lacerta geck*, mentioned in the note to the laſt article but one. See Roſenmüller in loc.

CHAP. XII.

THE regulations contained in the firſt five verſes of this chap. ſeem to be founded on ſome national prejudice, and not on any real difference in the condition of the mother; yet the prejudice was not peculiar to the Jews, or rather Egyptians, from whom I doubt not Moſes took the idea. Hippocrates, the father of Greek phyſic, thus expreſſes himſelf: Ἡ καθαρσις γινεται τησι γυναιξι μετα τον τοκον, ὡς επι το πολυ· επι μεν τῃ κουρῃ ἡμερῃσι τεσσαρακοντα και δυο . . . επι δε τῳ κουρῳ ἡ καθαρσις γινεται ἡμερῃσι τριακοντα.—The two periods, indeed, differ greatly; Hippocrates gives only 42 days after the birth of a girl, and 30 after the birth of a boy; Moſes allots to the former 80 days, to the latter 40. From the beſt inquiries, there is in this country no

* The Arabs call it *hardun*, חרדון; which is the term uſed by both Arabs here. † It is thus deſcribed by the Arab writers: "Animalculum *rubrum* terræ adherens, ut lacerta—quemcumque cibum aut potum *calcet* veneno ſuo "inficiens."—One would think that this is the ſame with the *lacerta gecko* of Linnæus, of which Haſſelquiſt: "The "poiſon of this animal is very ſingular, as it exhales from the *lobuli* of the toes. At Cairo I had once an opportunity "of obſerving how acrid the exhalations of the toes of this animal are. As it ran over the hand of a man, who was "endeavouring to catch it, there immediately roſe little red puſtules over all thoſe parts which the animal had touched." p. 220. ‡ That it lives altogether on air, is not probable; yet it certainly lives a conſiderable time without any viſible food.—"I kept one alive," ſays Haſſelquiſt, p. 219, "for 24 days, from the 8th of March to the 1ſt of "April, without affording it an opportunity of taking any food; yet it was nimble and lively during the whole time, "climbing up and down in its cage, fond of being near the light, and conſtantly rolling its eyes. I could however, at "laſt, plainly perceive that it waxed lean, and ſuffered from hunger."

foundation

foundation for any diſtinction: what may happen in other climates, it is impoſſible to ſay; but I believe it is all a ſuperſtitious prepoſſeſſion, founded on the ſuppoſed deteriority of the ſex.

CHAP. XIII.

FOR the nature of the *leproſy*, concerning which this chapter lays down very particular laws, I muſt refer my readers to thoſe who have purpoſely treated on the ſubject, more eſpecially to Hillary's *Obſervations on the Diſeaſes of Barbadoes*, Schilling *De Lepra*, and Dr. Ruſſel's *Hiſtory of Aleppo*. I ſhall content myſelf with making ſome philological remarks on certain words and paſſages.

Ver. 2. *A puſtule, ſcurf,* or *ſpot.* The Heb. words are שאת—ספחת—בהרת.—Sep. according to the common reading, have only *ουλη σημασιας τηλαυγης*; but I am perſuaded that the true reading is *σημασια*, which is that of Alex. and that *αυγασμα* has been dropped out of the text. It was read by Heſychius, and is the marginal reading of Leipſ.—In ch. 14. 56. the ſame Heb. words are in Sep. rendered *ουλης, και σημασιας, και του αυγαζοντος*; or, as Compl. and Oxon. *αυγασματος*.

Ver. 4. *The prieſt ſhall ſhut up the infected perſon,* &c. I have followed the common idea, which ſuppoſes that נגע is metonymically for the infected perſon: *plaga pro homine plagâ lepræ affecto.* But in the late Biſhop Law's MS. Notes I find another verſion, which is very plauſible: "The prieſt ſhall bind up the ſore;" and ſo, throughout, he renders הסגיר הכהן את הנגע.

Ver. 10. *And that there is alſo raw fleſh in the puſtule.* ומחית בשר חי בשאת. Lit. *et vivacitas carnis vivæ in tumore.* The verſion of Sep. appears ſtrange at firſt ſight, and has by ſome critics been deemed unintelligible. But I think it eaſy to reconcile it to ſenſe, and to the original. They conſidered the מ in מחית as a prefix, and gave to the word *ὑγιης* a meaning equivalent to *ζων*, as they do twice again in ver. 15. where *χρως ὑγιης* is the ſame with *caro viva.* I think, however, that the editions of Sep. are here wrongly pointed, and that ver. 10 and 11 ſhould be connected thus: *Και, απο του ὑγιους της σαρκος ζωσης εν τῃ ουλῃ, λεπρα παλαιουμενα εςιν.*

There is a ſeeming, and indeed but a ſeeming, redundancy in the text, which induced Nanninga and Roſenmüller to ſearch for a new meaning for the word מחית. The former, in a Diſſertation firſt printed at Grönigen in 1759, and reprinted in Schultens's *Sylloge* 1775, pars ii. p. 901—906, labours to prove that מחית here means "cicatrix ſeu locus ubi caro cutis "ſe in unum *contrahit*," from the Arab. חוי, *contrahere*; and thus he renders the verſe: "Et viderit ſacerdos, et ecce tumor albus in cute, hæc quæ mutavit pilum album, et *cicatrix*, "(vel ſi malis) *contractio* carnis vivæ ſit in illo tumore."—"Thus all is plain," adds he; but not ſo ſays Roſenmüller: "for, beſides that this interpretation appears to be far-fetched (far-"fetched indeed!) and unknown to all the ant. tranſlators, it is moreover inadmiſſible, be-"cauſe tumors in leproſy produce no ſuch *cicatrices*." Therefore Roſenmüller ſeeks another meaning, and finds it in the Chald. חוה and the Syr. חוי, which ſignify *indicare*. "Hence," ſays he, "מחיה, put here for מחויה, will be an *index, mark, ſign*; and the true rendering of "מחית בשר חי will be *ſignum carnis crudæ*."—Onkelos, Tharg. and the Syr. verſion, are certainly

certainly favourable to this interpretation, the two former having רושם, and the latter ורושמא; to whom ought to be added Arab. Erp. who has علامة; and this rendering is not implausible: yet I cannot think it the true one. I believe that מחות is here, not a *redundative*, but an *augmentative*, and well expreſſes the uncommon *redneſs* of the *raw*, or *living* fleſh, which appears in this ſort of leproſy, commonly called the *yaws*. See Hillary, in the work above mentioned.—Dathe renders, not improperly, thus: *Atque in eo præterea maſſa carnis rubræ exiſtit.*—Michaëlis: "Und in dem geſchwulſt ein rothes fleiſch."—So Hezel's improvement of Luther: "Und rohe fleiſch im geſchwür iſt."—Our Bate has alſo well expreſſed the meaning: "And quick fleſh be growing up in the riſing:" with this note: "or *a growth* "*of proud fleſh*, which is quick and ſore."—I had almoſt forgotten to remark, that Gr. Ven. has well and literally rendered his original by Και ζωωσιν σαρκος ζωσης εν τῳ ερματι.

Ver. 12. *But if the leproſy have ſo ſpread itſelf.* ואם פרוח תפרח הצרעת. Lit. *Si florendo floruerit*—Sep. εαν δε ανθουσα εξανθουσῃ λεπρα *—Vulg. *ſin autem efflоruerit diſcurrens lepra:* than which a better Latin verſion can hardly be made, as it admirably well expreſſes the laſt period of the *yaws*. See Hillary.

Ver. 23. *If the ſpot remain as it was.* אם תחתיה תעמד הבהרת. Lit. *Si* SUB SE *ſteterit ſplendor:* an Hebraiſm equivalent to *loco ſuo*, as all the antients render it, except Gr. Ven. who, according to his uſual method, gives us literal Greek for literal Hebrew: Ην δε εφ' εαυτῳ στη το λευκωμα τουτο.

Ib. *It is but the ſcar of the boil.* צרבת השחין הוא. Sep. ουλη του ἑλκους εϛι. Vulg. *ulceris eſt cicatrix.* And ſo equivalently all the antients, except Gr. Ven. who has καυσις του ἑλκους εϛι. Our common Engliſh verſion has: "It *is* a burning boil:" an unwarrantable tranſlation. Much better their predeceſſors, Coverdale and Matthew: "It is the print of the boil:" and Cranmer: "It is the ſcar of a boil."—I wonder that Dathe ſhould follow the other rendering: *Ulcus eſt inflammatum.*—Michaëlis: "So iſt es weiter nichts als ein vom geſchwür übrig "gebliebenes mahl." In like manner Hezel, Roſenmüller, and other moderns. צרבת is to be underſtood in the ſame ſenſe here as in ver. 28.

Ver. 30. *Yellowiſh hairs.* שער צהב דק.—Sep. θριξ ξανθουσα λεπτη †—Vulg. *capillus flavus, ſolitoque ſubtilior*—And ſo equivalently all the other verſions. I have not rendered the word דק, becauſe I believe that it relates not to the minuteneſs of the hairs, but to their colour, which was not quite *yellow*, but inclining to it, *yellowiſh*. Others may think otherwiſe. Our common verſion is, "a yellow thin hair;" followed by Bate and Purver.

Ib. *It is a leprous ſcall.* נתק הוא. The word נתק is variouſly rendered. Sep. θραυσμα—Vulg. *caret*—Onk. נתקא—Tharg. מחותא־ניתקא—Sam. ver. and Erp. נתק—Saad. כלף—Perſ. נשאן—Gr. Ven. σπασμα.—I find no better Engliſh term to expreſs the meaning of the original than that of our common verſion, *ſcall*, or *dandruff*.—Dathe, *porrigo*.—Michaëlis turns the colon thus: "So iſt es ein kopf-auſſatz oder bart-auſſatz."

Ver. 39. *It is but a morphew.* בהק הוא—Sep. and Gr. Ven. αλφος εϛιν—Vulg. *macula coloris candidi*—Onk. בוהקא—Syr, קלפיתא, *impetigo*; not *elephantiaſis*, as in Polyglott. Michaëlis‡ has clearly ſhown that this cutaneous diſorder is neither dangerous nor contagious. For the reſt, we

* Gr. Ven. Ην δε τῳ ανθειν ανθησῃ ἡ λεπρα. † Gr. Ven. Θριξ ξανθη λεπτη. ‡ *Moſ. Recht.* part iv. ſect. 210.

learn

learn from both Forſkal and Niebuhr that the ſame diſeaſe is ſtill called בהק by the Arabs of the preſent day.

Ver. 42. *A white and red ſore.* נגע לבן אדמם—Sep. αφη λευκη η πυρριζουσα—Vulg. *albus vel rufus color.* Hence ſome critics * think they muſt have read in their texts לבן או אדמם, and deem this reading preferable to that of the preſent text. The Syr. tranſlator has alſo the disjunctive particle או; but all the other verſions read as the Heb. nor is there any variety of lection in either the Heb. or Sam. MSS.; I cannot therefore but prefer it to that of Sep. The appearance here mentioned had a mixture of white and red in it, λευκη καταπυρος, as Gr. Ven. well renders. It is here oppoſed to the *obſcure white* mentioned in ver. 39.

Ver. 45. *A bandage about his chin.* ועל שפם יעטה. Sep. και περι το στομα αυτου περιβαλεσθω —Vulg. *os veſte contectum*; and ſo equivalently moſt of the ant. verſions. But if the bandage had been put about his mouth, how could he cry out "Unclean! unclean!" as he is ordered to do in the ſame verſe? The Thargumiſt, Pſeudo-Jonathan, ſeems to have been aware of this, and obviates the objection by giving a different nominative to יקרא. For thus he renders וכרוזא מכריז ואמר, *and a crier ſhall proclaim and ſay*, &c.—The word שפם occurs but five times in the Bible, nor is any help towards diſcovering its radical meaning to be derived from the other dialects. In 2 Sam. 19. 24. it is commonly rendered *beard*. In Ezek. 24. 17 and 22. and in Mic. 3. 7. it is, in our public verſion, rendered *lips*, and here *upper lip*; but it cannot, I think, mean either the *lips* or the *upper lip*, properly ſo called. It may poſſibly denote the *hair* about the *lips*, and ſo Saadias underſtood it. Gr. Ven. too, has κα'πι του μυζακος ἑιλησει: which coincides with our common verſion. I am apt to think, however, that it was not the *upper lip*, nor the *muſtachios* on it, that was covered, but the whole *chin* and *beard*; ſo that the mouth had juſt freedom to make the declaration "Unclean! unclean!" which, thus tied up, it muſt have done in a moſt doleful and alarming accent.

Ver. 47. Of the nature of the *leproſy* infecting garments, it is hard even to form a plauſible conjecture. When Michaëlis was conſidering the ſubject, he was told by a wool-merchant, that the wool of ſheep who die of diſeaſe, and which has not been ſhorn from the live animal, was unfit for manufacturing cloth, and liable to ſomething like what Moſes here deſcribes. I doubt very much of the fact, and would invite *our* cloth-manufacturers to examine the matter with accuracy, and deliver their candid opinions.

Ver. 48. *In the warp or in the woof.* בשתי או בערב. Sep. Η εν στημονι, η εν κροκη † —Vulg. *In ſtamine atque* (aut) *ſubtegmine*; and ſo the other verſions. Yet ſome moderns have objected to this verſion, as totally inadmiſſible: their reaſon is, that it is incompatible with ver. 52 and 56. "Quomodo enim," ſays Dathe, "comburi poteſt ſecundum ver. 52, *ſive* ſtamen, "*ſive* ſubtegmen vitioſæ veſtis? aut quomodo ex veſte, leprâ infecta, pars vitioſa, ſecundum "ver. 56, *vel* ex ſtamine, *vel* ex ſubtegmine ſcindi poteſt, cum tota veſtis, ſeu pannus, "ſtamine ac ſubtegmine unicè conſtet?"—I can readily anſwer theſe queries, which are founded on a falſe ſuppoſition. In ver. 52 it is not *either* the warp *or* the woof that is to be burned, but the whole garment in which a leproſy is found, either in the warp

* Michaëlis, Dathe, Roſenmüller, &c.—All our Engliſh verſions, down to Bate and Purver, have *a white reddiſh ſore*.

† The very ſame words are employed by Gr. Ven.

or in the woof; and that, in ver. 56, it is not either the warp or the woof that is to be torn out of the cloth, but the whole piece of cloth in which, whether in woof or warp, the infection is contained. This, to me, is ſo clear from the whole context, that I cannot but wonder how ſuch critics as Le Clerc, Houbigant, Dathe, and Roſenmüller, ſhould find any difficulty in the paſſage, and have recourſe to ſuch forced and far-fetched explanations.—Le Clerc imagined that by *warp* and *woof* were meant the threads of yarn before they were wove into cloth; an abſurd idea, as Dathe himſelf allows: but not much leſs ridiculous is that of Houbigant, which he however adopts: "Unus, quod ego quidem ſciam, *Houbi-*
" *gantius*, eam (difficultatem) removere tentavit. Primo, negat שתי et ערב *ſtamen* et *ſub-*
" *tegmen* ſignificare poſſe. Leguntur hæc vocabula tantum in hac pericopa, in qua illam
" ſignificationem, pro contextu, prorſus non habere poſſunt. Igitur de alia eſt cogitandum,
" quam contextus admittit. Jam vero conſtat ערב ſignificare veſtem texturæ diverſæ, hoc eſt,
" quæ conſtet filis ſpiſſioribus et tenuioribus, uti eſt in tapetibus et aliis veſtibus ex lana et
" lino paratis. Sub שתי vero intelligit *texturam ſimplicem* quæ conſtet filis ejuſdem formæ,
" ſive generis. Ex origine admittunt hanc ſignificationem: nam שתי ex Syr. אשתי texere
" illuſtrandum eſſe jam in Lexicis obſervatum eſt: ערב autem *miſcendi* notionem habere
" dubio caret: et quoniam tantum in hac pericopa occurrunt, nemo neget ea, ut vocabula
" artis, hanc ſignificationem habere poſſe. Non ſum neſcius ex contextu ſignificationem
" vocum divinari non tuto poſſe, qui ſæpe quam plures admittat; neque contradicam, ſi quis
" alias magis aptas ſignificationes illis vocibus ſubſtituat, dummodo mihi concedatur *hactenus*
" *allatas per contextum nullo modo eis tribui poſſe.*"

I have laid before my learned readers Dathe's own words, without abridgment, that I might not ſeem to weaken his argument; and now I only requeſt them to read over the text carefully, and then ſay if they ſee any neceſſity for abandoning the antient verſions, and for ſeeking a new meaning to the words שתי and ערב. Indeed, no two words are more fit to expreſs the *warp* and *woof* of a web. The former conſiſts of double rows, שתי, of threads, between which the latter paſſes, and by paſſing makes that *mixture* denoted by the word ערב. There is no need of having recourſe to the Syr. אשתי to explain the Heb. שתי: on the contrary, I believe the former, in the ſenſe of *weaving*, is a denominative verb from the latter. At any rate, it has nothing to do here; nor is שתי to be derived from שתה, *to drink*; it is neither more nor leſs than the fem. plur. of שני, *two*; and a moſt fit term, as I have already obſerved, to denote the *warp* of a web.

CHAP. XIV.

Ver. 4. *TWO ſmall birds.* שתי צפרים. Vulg. *duos paſſeres*, "two ſparrows;" and ſo ſome other verſions; but better Sep. δυο ορνιθια—Gr. Ven. δυω ορνεω. The word *ſparrow* is here too definite; any ſmall bird that was not unclean might be offered.

Ib. *Cedar-wood.* עץ ארז. Celſius will have it to be the *pine*; but there is no doubt of its being the *cedar*, which by the inhabitants of Lebanon is ſtill called by the ſame Heb. name.—For the reſt, it appears from Dioſcorides and other antient writers that cedar-wood

and

and hyſſop were uſed together as medicinal, and particularly in cutaneous diſorders. See Le Clerc in loc.

Ver. 10. *A log of oil.* The *log* is ſuppoſed to have contained ſix *eggs:* i. e. as much as the contents of ſix eggs.

Ver. 34. See my Explanatory Note. I will only add, that this ſort of houſe-leproſy is called by the Germans *ſalpeter fraſs*, as it is ſuppoſed principally to ariſe from *ſaltpetre.*—In theſe weſtern regions it is ſeldom very noxious, and for the moſt part only in the lower floors. See Michaëlis's *Moſaiſches Recht*, part iv. ſect. 11. p. 269, of the 2d edit.

Ver. 36. The laſt part of this verſe, ולא יטמא כל אשר בבית, has, I think, been univerſally miſunderſtood. Our common Engliſh verſion is, "that all that is in the houſe be not made "unclean;" correſponding with Vulg. *ne immunda fiant omnia quæ in domo ſunt*; and with Sep. *και ου μη ακαθαρτα γενηται ὁσα εν η εν τη οικιᾳ.* But this cannot, in my apprehenſion, be the meaning; for, how ſhould the prieſt's going into the houſe make any thing in it unclean? The meaning is, that although the walls of the houſe might be infected, yet its contents were not for that defiled. Theſe were therefore ordered to be brought out previouſly to the prieſt's going in, that the empty walls might be more accurately examined, and a judgment formed accordingly.

Ver. 37. *Exſudations.* שקערורות. Sep. κοιλωδας—Vulg. *quaſi valliculas*—Onk. פרזין, of a ſimilar ſignification: and ſo our common verſion, "hollow ſtreaks:" but in all ſuch appearance that I have ſeen, the *ſtreaks* were not hollow, but rather *convex*; and appeared to be *exſudations* from the wall, and for the moſt part of the colours here deſcribed. It is not eaſy to analyſe the Heb. word. See Caſtell on the root שקע. I think the Syr. tranſlator has well rendered it by קלפא; nor badly Saad. חטוט, *ſtreaks.*

CHAP. XV.

Ver. 2. *A GONORRHEA.* I am told that ſome would-be critics have made themſelves merry with this tranſlation of the Heb. זב מבשרו. One would imagine, ſay they, that the tranſlator were rather a M. D. than a D. D. to make uſe of ſuch a term in a verſion of the Bible. I ſhould be glad to know what other Engliſh word expreſſes the meaning of the original; not ſurely that of our common verſion; "a running iſſue out of his fleſh," although ſeven words be uſed to expreſs two! The marginal reading, "running of the reins," is more definite; but if I had been the firſt who had riſked it, I ſuſpect it would have provoked a deeper ſneer than *gonorrhea.* The *fluxus ſeminis* of Vulg. is a moſt proper *tranſlation*; and I might have rendered *a ſeed-flux*, as, in German, Michaëlis and Hezel, "ſaamenfluſs." Whether that or *gonorrhea* be the more decent term, I leave to the reader of candour and taſte to ſay.

Ver. 7. *Whoſoever toucheth his fleſh.* I have in Explan. Note ſaid, that it is uncertain whether the word *fleſh* here means the whole body, or only the part affected. Some think it denotes only the latter; and Dathe thus renders the comma, *qui verenda ejus tetigerit*;

gerit *, adopted by Roſenmüller, who adds: "Id quod ſine dubio eſt intelligendum "de medico vel chirurgo: hinc poteſt colligi, agi hoc loco de *gonorrhea virulenta*."—I ſtill doubt.

Ver. 16. *A ſeminal emiſſion.* שכבת זרע; rendered in our common verſion, "ſeed of copu- "lation;" and ſo ſeemingly † Sep. κοιτη σπερματος; and more clearly Vulg. *ſemen coïtus.*—The phraſe was well underſtood by Syr. Saad. and Perſ. who have all properly, though ſomewhat variouſly, rendered its true meaning. It evidently denotes *involuntary pollution*, particularly *nocturnal*; and not "the ſeed of copulation," to which ver. 18 refers.

Ver. 19. *She ſhall ſequeſter herſelf ſeven days.* "On the coaſt of Orixa, in India, women "in this ſituation are obliged to live ſeparated from ſociety four or five days, as impure and "defiled. Whatever they touch in this ſtate is equally deemed unclean; and they are under "a legal obligation of purifying themſelves by bathing, and certain beverages." Sonnerat, vol. i. p. 31.—What were the ideas of the antient Romans concerning this ſort of impurity, it may be ſeen in Pliny, vii. 15. where he gives a horrid picture indeed of *menſtruation* ‡.

Ver. 24. *Lying by her.* שכב אתה; rendered in our common verſion, "lying with her;" and this, perhaps, was then no improper verſion, as *with* might have the ſame meaning as *by*: but as, by this latter word, the ambiguity is removed, I preferred it in my verſion. See Explan. Note.—Dathe, very properly, *juxta eam*; and, long before, honeſt Luther, "Und wenn "ein mann bey ihr lieget." Michaëlis: "Läge jemand mit ihr in eben demſeben bette."—It was lying *in the ſame bed with*, and not *lying with*, the menſtruous woman, that is here forbidden. See ch. 20. 18. where he who *lay with* a woman in that ſituation is to be *cut off* from among his people.

CHAP. XVI.

Ver. 2. *IN the cloud.* Moſt of interpreters underſtand this of the cloud which guided the Iſraelites out of Egypt, and had hitherto hovered over the tabernacle, but now took its poſition over the ark, on which it reſted ever after as a ſymbol of the divine preſence, which the Jews call their *ſchechinah*. But this is all aſſertion, without the ſhadow of proof. The cloud here mentioned is evidently the cloud of ſmoke, as explained in ver. 13.—I ſubjoin the excellent note of Roſenmüller: "Totius igitur verſus ſenſus eſt hic: Non veniat Aaron "ad me ſic leviter: non ita temerè coram me compareat; moriretur, enim, ſi hoc auderet: "verum conſpiciar in nube, (ſeu per nubem) ſcilicet *fumi ex ſuffitu*, quæ tegat propitiato- "rium, totamque adeo arcam. Qui adytum ingrediendi modus ver. 12, 13. plenius deſcri- "bitur, ubi diſſertè dicitur *nubem ſuffitus tegere debere operculum, quod ſuper arca Legum eſt.*

* So likewiſe Michaëlis: "Wer die ſchaamtheile des kranke berühret." † I ſay ſeemingly; for κοιτη is not probably here for coïtus, but for *cubile*, or *cubatio*. ‡ "Nihil facilè reperiatur mulierum profluvio magis "monſtrificum. Aceſcunt ſuperventu muſta—ſterileſcunt tactæ fruges, moriuntur inſita, exuruntur hortorum ger- "mina; & fructus arborum, quibus inſedêre, decidunt. Speculorum fulgor adſpectu ipſo hebetatur—acies ferri per- "ſtringitur, eboriſque nitor—alvei apium emoriuntur—æs etiam ac ferrum rubigo protinus corripit—in rabiem "aguntur guſtato canes, atque inſanabili veneno morſus inficitur, &c. &c.!"—This is ſurely *high*, but as certainly *falſe*, colouring.

"Si

" Si autem jam fuiſſet nubes in Propitiatorio, quæ divinæ majeſtatis præſentiam occultaret, " cur Deus juſſiſſet aliam excitare ex ſuffitu, quæ hanc ipſam nubem ita occultaret, ut nec a " pontifice poſſet conſpici."

Ver. 8. *The ſcape-goat.* The Heb. word is עזאזל; the meaning of which has, without much reaſon, I think, been much conteſted. It appears to be a compound of עז and אזל, which laſt, in Arab. ſignifies *removed, ſeparated, receded*; and the Sept. have well rendered by *αποπομπαιος*—Vulg. *emmiſſarius.*

Ver. 21. *By a perſon appointed.* ביד איש עתי. Sep. *εν χειρι ανθρωπου ετοιμου*—Vulg. *per hominem paratum.* It has been thought that they read in their text עתיד; but as there is no veſtige of ſuch a reading in any Heb. or Sam. copy, I think it is more probable that they gave to עתי a meaning not indeed ſo appropriate as might have been given, but ſtill ſuitable to the place. איש עתי ſignifies *a man choſen for the occaſion, vir opportunus*; or, as Gr. Ven. has very properly rendered, *ανηρ δριστης.*

CHAP. XVII.

Ver. 3. IT is diverting to obſerve how the ſticklers for the integrity of the preſent Hebrew text ſtrain themſelves to defend the reading in this verſe, and reconcile it with Deut. 12. 15. To tell us that Moſes here forbids the private ſlaughtering and eating of clean animals, on account of the propenſity of the Iſraelites to idolatry, and yet repeals this very interdiction when he comes to the confines of Chanaan, is ſurely to amuſe us with the moſt futile of all arguments; as if the Iſraelites were leſs in danger of being led into idolatry at the latter period than at the former. But what need of all this, when the Sam. text has preſerved the very words that are here wanting to make Moſes conſiſtent with himſelf?—If it be urged, that the addition in the Sam. text is an interpolation from Deut. I would aſk, how this ſame interpolation came into the Greek verſion of Sep. made by Jews, and uſed in their Egyptian ſynagogues?—" They tranſlated," it has been anſwered, " from a Sam. copy."—Did they? Then, to me, nothing can be a ſtronger preſumption in favour of the Sam. copy, as they muſt have conſidered it as a pure and genuine text at the time when they made their tranſlation. Indeed, without their admirable tranſlation, and the Sam. copy of the original, we ſhould have but a lame copy of the Pentateuch; as I hope to be able to evince in another place.

Ver. 7. *To demons, after which they hanker.* לשעירים אשר הם זנים אחריהם; in our common verſion rendered, " unto devils, after whom they have gone a-whoring." Sep. and Vulg. have likewiſe *εκπορνευουσιν*, and *fornicati ſunt*; but the other verſions* mollify the word זנים into *going aſtray, following, hankering after*, which I have imitated in my tranſlation. For the reſt, perhaps *goats* would be preferable to *demons*; and ſo Bate in his verſion, and both Secker and Law in their MS. notes. Others render *ſatyrs:* ſo Dathe, *ſatyris*—Michaëlis, " waldteufeln."—The prohibition evidently alludes to the worſhip of Pan, under the form

* Except Gr. Ven. which here agrees with Sep.

of

of *a goat*, or other wild *hairy* animal, ſuch as the fauns and ſatyrs were repreſented to be. The Egyptians of Mendés were, in particular, noted for this ſort of idolatry, which was highly obſcene and laſcivious. See Bochart. *Hieroz.* p. 1. l. 11. c. 53.

CHAP. XVIII.

Ver. 6. *TO uncover her nakedneſs.* לגלות ערוה. Sep. *αποκαλυψαι αισχημοσυνην* *—Vulg. *ut revelet turpitudinem ejus*; and ſo equivalently all the other verſions. And perhaps *ſhame* would be here a more proper word than *nakedneſs.*

Ib. *I, the Lord,* forbid it. There is, in the original, only אני יהוה, *Ego Jehovah!* commonly rendered, "I *am* the Lord." But this, to me, appears rather a frigid verſion; and I would, with the judicious Arab. tranſlator Saadias, ſupply the words *ſo command,* or *ſo forbid,* according to the exigency of the text.

Ver. 7. *The nakedneſs of thy father, that is, the nakedneſs of thy mother,* &c. That the copulative *vau* in this verſe is to be rendered by *that is,* and not by *or,* as in our com. verſion, is clear from the context, although the antients have paid no attention to it. All the precepts are addreſſed to the *male,* as the principal agent in ſuch unlawful violations of pudicity. In this particular prohibition the turpitude of the crime is pointed out as doubly criminal, in as far as *uncovering the nakedneſs* of a mother is a grievous injury done to the father.—Dathe, elegantly, *Verenda patris tui, hoc eſt, verenda matris tuæ, ne retegas.* Michaëlis: "Du, ſohn, ſollſt die blöſe deines vaters, das iſt, die blöſe deiner mutter, nicht aufdecken."

Ver. 9. *Born at home, or born abroad*; i. e. either in wedlock, or out of wedlock.—Note, that both here and in ver. 11, the word מולדת is wrongly pointed, as if it were in the *coactive* voice, or *hiphil,* whereas it is clear that it is in the *copaſſive,* or *hophal.*

Ver. 16. The precept contained in this verſe gave riſe to a violent controverſy, about the beginning of our Engliſh Reformation. The real, or pretended, ſcruples of Henry VIII. about the validity of his marriage with his brother's widow, being communicated to his biſhops, it was deemed proper to propoſe the queſtion to the moſt celebrated Univerſities of Europe for their deciſion. Their deciſions in general were, that, if the prior marriage were conſummated, the poſterior one was abſolutely unlawful. But thoſe good caſuiſts ſeem to have forgotten, or to have overlooked, the other precept in Deut. 25. 5. where there is no word of conſummation, or non-conſummation, but merely the want of children in the defunct brother, which was evidently the caſe with reſpect to Prince Arthur. Either then the precept in Levit. was in contradiction with that in Deut. or it was not unlawful for Henry to marry the wife of his brother, who had died without iſſue. Nay, if the laws of Moſes, in this reſpect, are ſuppoſed to bind Chriſtians, Henry was obliged to marry his brother's widow, to raiſe up ſeed to his brother. But, indeed, the reaſonings in favour of a diſſolution of that marriage were a tiſſue of ſcholaſtic ſophiſtry, ſupported by the more ſolid argument of deſpotic power; not to mention the Engliſh gold which was ſpent on that occaſion to influence the venal *oracles* to return favourable reſponſes.

* The ſame term is uſed by Gr. Ven.

Ver. 21. *Thou ſhalt not devote any of thy offspring to Moloch.* מזרעך לא תתן להעבר למלך. Inſtead of להעביר, the Sam. T. has להעביד; and ſo read Sep. απο του σπερματος σου ου δωσεις λατρευειν Αρχοντι; and Vulg. may have followed the ſame reading, *De ſemine tuo non dabis, ut conſecretur idolo Moloch.* This, however, is ambiguous, and may have equally ſprung from the preſent reading. Singular is the verſion of Syr.: מן זרעך לא תרמא למבטנו נובריתא, *De ſemine tuo non ejicias, ad gravidandam alienam.* How he could make this out of the preſent Heb. it is impoſſible to conceive; but he either read differently, or gueſſed at ſome meaning which ſhould bear ſome analogy to the context; for it muſt be confeſſed, that the precept, as it now ſtands, comes in awkwardly, and ſeems to be out of its place. For the reſt, the word מלך, or מולך, is the participle active of מלך, *to reign*; and in this ſenſe it is rendered not only by Sep. αρχοντι, but even by Gr. Ven. Προς τε τω σπερματος σου ου δωσεις τω βασιλευοντι. MOLOCH was probably ſome powerful *king*, to whom divine honours were paid after his death, and human ſacrifices offered to him, as they were to Saturn. See the Rem. on 2 K. 23. 10. I have, with Jerom, ſo worded my verſion here, as to make it agree with either of the texts.

CHAP. XIX.

Ver. 10. *NOR ſhall ye go a ſecond time over your vine-yards and olive-yards.* כרמך לא תעולל. The word כרם ſignifies both a vine-yard and olive-yard, and indeed every thing of the orchard kind. The precept is thus rendered by Sep. τον αμπελωνα σου ουκ επαναστρυγησεις, ουδε τους ρωγας του αμπελωνος σου συλλεξεις. The Syr. tranſlator conſidered the firſt comma as relating to *ungathered grapes*, and the ſecond to *fallen olives*, ונתרא דזתיכן לא תקטוף. Vulg. *Neque, in vinea tua, racemos et grana decedentia congregabis.*

Ver. 19. The three precepts contained in this verſe are perfectly agreeable to good agriculture and good economy, nor is it needful to look for any other myſtery in them.

Ver. 20. I have in Explan. Note ſaid, that I was not ſure but the Sam. lection is here preferable to the preſent Hebrew; I ſhall here ſubjoin them in two parallel lines.

HEB.—בקרת תהיה' . . לא יומתו' כי לא חפשה.
SAM.—בקרת תהיה לו' לא יומת'. כי לא חפשה.

Now hear Houbigant: "Hodiernæ ſcripturæ hæc vitia ſunt. Primum, in verbis בקרת תהיה, "ambiguum relinqui, *cujus* animadverſio ſit facienda, an viri, an mulieris, an amborum. "Itaque abeunt in alterutram ſententiam Veteres. Gr. quidem Syr. et Vulg.* credidere, "inquiſitionem, ſeu animadverſionem fieri amborum; Chald. et uterque Arabs, ſolius muli-"eris: atque iis obſequuntur plerique Judæi recentiores; ſancientes legem omnium legum "iniquiſſimam: ut vir, cujus peccatum gravius, *non flagelletur*, mulier *flagelletur*, quæ "virum petiiſſe non dicatur; imo quam Lex innuat fuiſſe per vim violatam—Alterum vitium "eſt in verbo יומתו, de femina aut de viro dicto. Nam cum Lex cauſam ſubjungat talem, "כי לא חפשה, *quia non libera*, difficile eſt intelligere, cur femina, ſi criminis rea eſt, idcirco

* He ſhould have added Tharg. and Perſ.—Gr. Ven. has only ερασμος τελεσει.

"non

" non ſit morte multanda, qui non ſit libera. Utrum, enim, ſi libera eſſet, morte dignior " eſſet? .... His vitiis, in Sam. Scriptura occurritur, dum additur לו, (quod, prope לא, fuit " a ſcribis Judæis prætermiſſum,) ut lex animadvertat in eum cujus eſt culpa gravior, neque " eum tamen mortis pœnâ condemnet, ut ſi liberam ſubegiſſet, quia in ſervæ et liberæ " deſponſatione non paria jura ſunt, cum non par ſit matrimonii utriuſque conditio."—It muſt be confeſſed that this is no feeble reaſoning, and the author has formed his verſion accordingly: " De eo legibus quæretur; ſed morte non damnabitur, quia mulier non eſt libera." But he has, as far as I know, been followed by no latter interpreters, who generally follow the Vulg. *vapulabunt ambo, et non morientur*, &c. Yet the more I conſider the matter, the more I am inclined to be of Houbigant's opinion.

Ver. 23. *Its firſt fruit ye ſhall count as uncircumciſed: three years*, &c. The meaning is, that the branches of newly-planted trees are not to be allowed to fructify for the firſt three years; which is ſtill conſidered as a piece of good horticultural economy, eſpecially with regard to vines.

Ver. 26. *Ye ſhall not eat upon the mountains.* The preſent Heb. has לא תאכלו על הדם, and the precept is thought to forbid the eating of blood; but this prohibition had been ſo often and ſo preſſingly enjoined before, and enjoined in its proper places*, that we look not for a repetition of it here, where it comes in ſo abruptly. Beſides, the phraſe אכל על הדם, *to eat on the blood*, is a ſtrange aſſemblage of words. " But על," it is ſaid, " is here for עם, as appears " from Deut. 12. 23. where עם, not על, is in the text." This is a poor ſubterfuge; for, firſt, granting that על here were equivalent to עם, the matter would not be much mended: the phraſe אכל עם הדם, without any adjunct, is nearly as ſtrange as אכל על הדם. The phraſe in Deut. is very different; the עם there has its regimen לא תאכל הנפש עם הבשר: and in Levit. interpreters are obliged to ſuppreſs the על altogether, as Syr. or ſupply a word to make up the ſentence; as *any thing*, in our common verſion; or *fleſh*, or ſome ſuch word. But it will be difficult, I think, to ſhew ſuch another *ellipſis* in the Heb. Scriptures. On the other hand, we learn from Ezekiel that *eating on the mountains* was conſidered as a crime, and is by him claſſed with idolatry and other grievous tranſgreſſions †. Is it probable, then, that there ſhould be no mention, no prohibition, made of it in the law of Moſes? But if it be not here mentioned, it is nowhere mentioned. I am therefore fully perſuaded that the Septuagint have alone preſerved the genuine reading; ההרים inſtead of הדם; Μη εσθετε επι των ορεων: which I have followed in my verſion.

Ib. *Nor .... practiſe divination, nor augury.* לא תנחשו' ולא תעוננו. The former denotes divination by means of *ſerpents*, which, as Bochart ‡ has ſhewn, was not uncommon among the antients. The latter means prognoſtications or omens from the *clouds*, or the face of the heavens, alluded to by Jerem. 10. 2: " He who obſerveth the wind," ſays Solomon, " ſhall not " ſow; and he who regardeth the clouds ſhall not reap." Eccleſ. 11. 4.

Ver. 27. *The hair of your heads*, &c. " Les Perſans," ſays La Roque, " qui rognent la " barbe, et la raſent par deſſus la machoire, ſont reputés heretiques par les Arabes." Voyage

* See Levit. 3. 17.—7. 26.—17. 10, 12, 14. † Ezek. 18. 6. אל ההרים לא אכל' ועיניו לא נשא אל גלולי בית ישראל. ‡ Hierozoicon. pars 1. lib. 1. ch. 3.

dans

dans la Paleſtine, p. 142. Yet the Arabs themſelves, in the days of Herodotus, ſeem to have been given to ſimilar practices.

Ver. 31. *Necromancers.* האבת; or rather, as Sam. האובות—Sep. and Gr. Ven. *εγγαστριμυθοι.* They took the idea from אוב, a *bottle* or *bladder*: becauſe the belly of the *ventriloquiſt* was ſuppoſed to be inflated. Vulg. has *magi*; and ſo moſt of the other verſions. Our common tranſlation: "them that have familiar ſpirits."—It is pretty clear from 1 Sam. 28. 8—19. that the word means a *necromancer*. See C. R. on that place.

Ver. 35. In my Explan. Note I have ſaid, that perhaps this verſe ſhould be rendered thus: "In the regulations of meaſures and weights, ye ſhall, &c." The Heb. is: לא תעשו עול במשפט במדה במשקל ובמשורה; where עול במשפט, *iniquitas in judicio*, may be an elegant Hebraiſm, equivalent to *iniquum judicium*: and indeed I am apt to think that this is really the caſe. The Greek *αδικον εν κρισει* may be taken in the ſame ſignification: ſo that the whole precept regards only three things, *meting*, *weighing*, and *meaſuring*.

CHAP. XX.

Ver. 10. *IF any man commit adultery with his neighbour's wife.* Heb. ואיש אשר ינאף את אשת רעהו [איש אשר ינאף את אשת]; where the words within brackets I conſider as an interpolation. They are wanting in 3 of Kennicott's MSS.; but they ſeem to have been read by all the antients, and may be a pure tautology; which, however, is better omitted in a tranſlation. Our common verſion patches up the verſe thus: "And the man that committeth adultery "with *another* man's wife, *even he* that committeth adultery with his neighbour's wife, the "adulterer and the adultereſs ſhall ſurely be put to death;" where mark, that the whole conſtruction is embarraſſed and ungrammatical. Elegantly, as uſual, Dathe: *Qui cum uxore alterius adulterium commiſerit, morte afficiatur, tum adulter, tum adultera.*

Ver. 17. *It is a ſhameleſs deed.* Heb. חסד הוא. It is not eaſy to account for ſuch a *catachreſis* of the word חסד, which every where elſe denotes *benignity*, *mercy*, *piety*; and I much ſuſpect that we ought to read חסר *: yet there is no variety of lection. Our lexicographers explain it thus: "The primitive meaning of the word," ſay they, "is *exceſs* of any kind: "hence it ſignifies an exceſs of *fraternal love*; that is, *inceſt*." Michaëlis juſtly laughs at this rabbinical notion. His own opinion he gives in the following words: "Mihi quidem de "חסד ſic videtur. *Amoris* ſignificationem habet, et vero ejus quem Greci proprio nomine "*ερως*, Latini *pietatem* vocant. Hinc, *inceſtus cum ſorore*, חסד dicitur; planè ut nos *amoris* "nomine in deterius quoque abutimur." This is not very ſatisfactory; and better have recourſe to the Syr. and Chald. in which חסד means *probrum*, *dedecus*. Be this as it may, the word is certainly here to be taken in a bad ſenſe. Sep. and Gr. Ven. *ονειδος*—Vulg. *nefaria res*—Onk. קלנא—Syr. חסדא; and ſo equivalently the other verſions.

Ver. 20. *Childleſs ſhall they die.* ערירים † ימתו—Sep. *ατεκνοι αποθανουνται*—Vulg. *abſque liberis morientur*; and ſo the other verſions. The only queſtion is, whether the puniſhment

* See the Arab. חסר, which, with other meanings, has that of *laſciviouſneſs*. † For ימתו, 2 of Kennicott's MSS. have יהיו, *ſhall they be*.

here threatened is to be inflicted by the hand of God or by the hand of man; i. e. whether the words be a prediction or an injunction. They admit either of the meanings; and the idiomatic phraseology seems to favour the latter.

Ver. 26. *The Lord your God.* After these words, there is in the Coptic version this singular addition: "who brought you out of the land of Egypt;" and which, it is very probable, they read in their Greek copy.

CHAP. XXI.

Ver. 4. *BUT if she have a husband among his people, he shall not dishonour himself by incurring uncleanness on her account.* In the present Heb. text are only the following words: לא יטמא בעל בעמיו להחלו: by our English translators rendered: "*But* he shall not defile himself, *being* a "chief man among his people, to profane himself;" which, he who understands must have an acute intellect. Indeed the text, as it now stands, is unintelligible. It is clear that the law in question regards the priests, the ordinary priests, the sons of Aaron; what business, then, has a chief of the people to do here? Jerom saw this, and so formed his version, as if he had read לבעל *, as before לאחתו: *sed nec in principe populi sui contaminabitur*; which makes, at least, a connected sense, adopted by Dathe and Rosenmüller. Michaëlis thinks that בעל is here the *high-priest:* but this is highly improbable. He is never so denominated, and the law with respect to him is couched in other words in ver. 10.—Bate obviates the difficulty thus: "*As* a husband, he (the priest) shall not be defiled, &c.†" But the word בעל never signifies a husband, without some adjunct. The version of Sep. is singular: Ου μιανθησεται ΕΞΑΠΙΝΑ εν τω λαω αυτου, κ. τ. λ. Such is the common reading; but Cod. Alex. and Glasg. want ου μιανθησεται, and join εξαπινα, &c. to ver. 3. In either case the reading is not inept; but it supposes that not בעל was in their text, but כבלע, as in Num. 4. 20. and not בעגל, as Capellus conjectured. But even this, to me, appears unsatisfactory; and I am convinced that a word has been dropped out of the text, which I would restore thus: ולא יטמא [לבעלת] בעל‡ בעמיו. Or, if it be granted that בעלה may, without any adjunct, denote *a married woman*, which I doubt, the restoration of the text might consist of the addition of a single letter, or at most two letters; and the reading be either לבעלה or בבעלה, or even § בבעל: but I think the other amendment preferable, which leaves בעל as it is, and is more analogous to the Heb. idiom. This restored reading is partly supported by Vulg. Saad. and the first lection of 1 Heb. and 1 Chald. MS. which have the copulative before לא; and partly by Sep.; who, although they read בלע for בעל, yet must have found either כ or ב before it, since they rendered εξαπινα. In short, the context itself almost demonstrates this to be the true reading, as two cases are contrasted, in one of which the priest is allowed to do the funeral duties to a deceased sister, in the other not.

* Or בבעל, as the Syr. translator seems to have read. † Purver: "A husband among his people shall not "be defiled, &c." And similar is the marginal reading of our common version: *being an husband among his people, he shall not defile himself* for his wife. ‡ As in Gen. 20. 3. and Deut. 22. 22. § It is well known that the ה final has been sometimes dropped by the Masoretical copyists, as in נער for נערה.

Ver. 7.

Ver. 7. This verſe, in our public verſion, is a ſingular inſtance of the abſurdity of a verbal tranſlation. It runs thus: "THEY ſhall not take a wife *that* is a whore, or profane; nei-"ther ſhall they take a woman put away from her huſband; for HE *is* holy unto his God." Who is *holy?* The *huſband*, according to the verſion; but *any one* of the prieſts, according to the text. The *enallage*, therefore, ought not to have been followed; and the following of it here, and in ſix hundred other places, renders the tranſlation obſcure and ambiguous.

Ver. 8. *Who have hallowed them.* מקדשם. For ſo rightly the Sam. T. and ſo Sep. ὁ ἁγιαζων αυτους. It is here queſtion of the *prieſts*, and not of the people at large.

Ver. 12. *The badge* of holineſs. Although both texts have here only נזר שמן משחת, yet I cannot help thinking that a word has been dropped, and that the text originally was נזר הקדש ושמן משחת. The נזר, or badge of holineſs, is never elſewhere joined with שמן, and indeed had no connection with it: it was a part of the *tiara*, or *mitre*, and is expreſsly called *the badge of holineſs*, נזר הקדש, in Exod. 29. 6, 7. The addition, however, I have put in Italics, as it is a mere conjectural emendation, unſupported by any text or verſion.

Ver. 14. *Nor an harlot.* In the preſent text there is no copulative before זנה, which made our Engliſh tranſlators, with their uſual ſcrupuloſity, put *or* in Italics. But זונה is the reading of Sam. and was that of Sep. and the other verſions marked in Var. Read.

Ver. 18. *Maimed.* חרם. Sep. κολοβορω—Vulg. *parvo naſo*—Onk. retains the Heb. word—Tharg. דלקי בחוטמיה—Syr. סרם—Sam. ver. סטיר—Saad. אלאחרס—Erp. נאקץ—Gr. Ven. σιμος. There is, then, a pretty general concurrence in favour of ſome *defect* about the *noſe*; yet I take the meaning of חרם to be, ſimply, *maimed*, from the Arab. חרם, *ſecare*, *mutilare*. So Dathe: *ſive mutilus*, *ſive membris juſto longioribus*. But Michaëlis ſticks to *noſe*: "Keiner "dem das naſenbein eingedrücket iſt." Our common verſion: "*He* that hath a flat noſe."—To me it appears that the word is in contraſt with that which follows; and that, as the latter denotes ſomething *ſuperfluous* in the perſon, the former denotes a *deficiency*. Hence the Erpenian Arab. has well rendered both או נאקץ או זאיד.

Ver. 20. *Extenuated.* דק. Sep. εφηλος *—Vulg. *lippus*—Onk. דוקא—Syr. אעור—Sam. ver. ננוס †—Saad. אחפס—Erp. מדקוק—Gr. Ven. ϛωωδης ‡.—I think that the Erp. Arab. has again properly rendered the Heb. word, which gives naturally the meaning of *gracilis*, *extenuatus*.

Ib. *Pearl-eyed.* Heb. בלל בעיני—Sep. πτιλλος τους οφθαλμους—Vulg. *albuginem habens in oculo*—Onk. חליו בעיניה—Syr. נתירין גביעודי—Saad. מן פי עינה וכת—Erp. כתיב פי עינה—Gr. Ven. λελευκωμεος εν ομμασιν—The verſion of Aquila ſeems to have been ὑποχυσις; that of Sym. λευκωμα, which accords with Vulg. Roſenmüller thinks it may ſignify *blear-eyed*, which Aquila's verſion favours. Dathe, *albuginem habens in oculo*.

Ib. *Or have a dry or purulent ſcab.* או גרב או ילפת—Sep. η ανθρωπος ω̃ αν η εν αυτω ψωρα αγρια η λειχην—Vulg. habens *jugem ſcabiem*, *vel impetiginem in corpore*—Gr. Ven. ψωριων η ερπετιων. The other verſions either retain the Heb. terms or uſe others that denote *ſome ſort* of

* The meaning of this word is uncertain. According to Heſychius, it denotes one *who has nail-ſpots in his face*; according to others, *one having bloodſhot eyes*. † The Latin, *nanus*; ſo that this and Syr. favour our common Engliſh verſion, *dwarf*; but better is the marginal reading, *too ſlender*. Bate, not badly, *conſumptive*. ‡ So the word is printed; but what it means I know not.

ſcab; but the latter ſeems to be a *purulent* ſcab, or ſpecies of leproſy, called *impetigo Ægyptiaca.*

Ib. *Or having a rupture.* מרוח אשך—Sep. *μονορχις*—Vulg. *bernioſus*—Onk. מריס בחריך—Tharg. Jer. דחסר כוליא—Syr. דאוחדא אשכה—Saad. אדר—Erp. מחרפס אלאנתיין—Sam. ver. מרוח עטיב—Perſ. דמידה ואאית—Gr. Ven. *τεθλασμενος των αρχιν.*—Thus the authorities are divided. but Vulg. Saad. and the Perſic verſion ſeem to have beſt underſtood their original; for, the word מרוח, as Roſenmüller obſerves, is not to be derived from מרח, but is the participle paſſive of רוח; and the meaning of the two words is *inflatus teſticulos*, or, as Perſ. *tuberoſos* habens *teſticulos.* Dathe, however, follows the common verſion, which is that of Onkelos, *in teſticulo contuſus:* and ſo our vulgar verſion, who *hath his ſtones broken.* Michaëlis; "keiner, dem das "männliche glied verleſſet iſt."

CHAP. XXII.

Ver. 22. *LACERATED.* חרוץ. Sep. *γλωσσοτμητος*—Vulg. *cicatricem habens*—Onk. פסיק—Syr. חאא—Saad. מבתורת—Erp. מקטוע—Sam. ver. חרציץ—Perſ. בריד—Gr. Ven. *τετμημενος.*—The majority is then for *lacerated*, or *cut*, and etymology evidently points that way.—Our common verſion, *maimed.* Dathe, *laceratum.* Michaëlis leaves it untranſlated, "rather than adopt any of the faulty verſions of the antients."

Ib. *Having the rot.* יבלת. Sep. *μυρμηκιων*—Vulg. *papulas habens*—Onk. יבלן, rendered in Pol. *papulas habens*, but without any good authority—Syr. רשל, *weak, diſtempered*—Saad. דאת תלול, *having warts*—Erp. מדבנל, rendered by Caſtell *verrucoſus*, but which ſhould, I think, be rendered *marcidus*—Sam. ver. חבלי, *rotten*—Perſ. ובי, *having a flux*, which always accompanies the *rot* in ſheep, and which the Heb. word itſelf alſo denotes. I have no doubt, then, of its being *the rot.* Our common verſion, *having a wen.* The Gr. Ven. ſeems to have had ſome ſuch idea in view when he rendered *φυματιων.* Dathe follows Sep.: *myrmeciis affectum.* Michaëlis: "krank."

Ib. Having *the dry, or purulent, ſcab.* The Heb. words are the ſame which have been explained before in ch. 21. 20.

Ver. 23. *Which hath any ſuperfluity.* שרוע—Sep. *ωτοτμητος*—Vulg. *aure amputatus.* So equivalently Syr.; but all the other verſions, even Gr. Ven. have words that denote *excreſcence, ſuperfluity*, &c.; and ſo our common verſion.

Ib. *Or deficiency.* קלות—Sep. *κολοβοκερκος*—Vulg. caudâ *amputatus.* And ſo Syr.; but the reſt have words denoting *ſomething wanting, deficiency*; and the word is evidently contraſted with the preceding one. Both terms are well rendered by Perſ. זאדה אנדאם וכם אנדאם, member-abounding, or member-lacking. Well, alſo, Gr. Ven. *υπερτεταμενον η βεβραχυμενον.*—Dathe: *membro corporis vel longiores, vel breviores.* Michaëlis: "das ein glied des leibes zu "lang oder zu kurz hat." Our common verſion: "that hath any thing ſuperfluous or lack-"ing in his parts."

Ver. 24. *What hath been emaſculated, either by confriction, or contuſion, or evulſion, or exſection.* Four modes of emaſculating are here enumerated. The Hebrew words are—מעוך—

מעוך—כתות—נתוק—כרות—by Sep. rendered, θλαδιων—εκτεθλιμμενον—εκτομιων—απεσπασμενον—Vulg. *quod vel contritis, vel tuſis, vel ſectis ablatiſque teſticulis.* Onk. נזיר—שליף—רסיס—מריס Syr. . . . . —רציץ—פסיק—קתיע—Sam. ver. מעיך—כתית—נתיק—עקיר—Saad. ממרוס—מדקוק—Erp. מקטוע—מנצל—ממרוס—מחשם—מזלוע—מקטוע—Perſ. מאלידה—כופתה—קסיחתה—ברידה—Gr. Ven. θλιβος—τεθλασμενος—ανεσπασμενος—τετμημενος.——So uncommon a coincidence in almoſt all the verſions is a ſtrong proof that the Heb. words have the meaning here aſſigned to them, and that they denote four different modes of caſtration practiſed in the days of Moſes. One reaſon for this prohibitory law may have been, as Michaëlis obſerves, to deter the Iſraelites from the caſtration of men, practiſed by the neighbouring nations. See *Moſaiſches Recht.* part iii. ſect. 168. p. 158.

CHAP. XXIII.

Ver. 9. I HAVE ſaid, in Explanatory Note, that this, and a part of verſe 10, would be better out of the text. It is clear, that the ſpeech of the Lord to Moſes is continued from verſe 1, without interruption, to the end of the chapter, which altogether relates to the various feſtivals, and the manner of celebrating them. The phraſe, then, *Again the Lord ſpoke to Moſes*, &c. is a needleſs repetition, both here and in verſes 23, 26, and 33. But as theſe reiterations are in both texts, and in all the antient verſions, I durſt not throw them out.

Ver. 10. *The firſt-reaped ſheaf.* The word rendered ſheaf is עמר, which ſignifies alſo a certain meaſure called an *omer*; and Delgado finds fault with our tranſlators for not ſo rendering it here. But our tranſlators did right to be guided by Sep. and the other antient verſions, which all have words that denote *a ſheaf.* Even the Gr. of Venice has το δραγμα, the very word uſed by Sep.; and indeed etymology confirms this rendering: עֹמֶר, in Arabic, ſignifies *to bind, a bundle,* &c. The Egyptians offered the firſt-fruits of their fields to Iſis. See Diodor. Sic. lib. i.

Ver. 14. *Toaſted grain* rubbed out *of the full ear.* קלי וכרמל; commonly rendered as if they were two different things, as in our public verſion, " nor parched corn, nor green ears." But from a compariſon with ch. 2. 14. I am convinced that we are to conſider the words as a *hendiadys*, and that they mean only one thing, namely, *full ears* of corn *toaſted*, or *parched.* So Sep. underſtood them, without noticing the copulative before כרמל: αρτον, και πεφρυγμενα χιδρα νεα.

Ver. 24. *To be commemorated by ſhouting.* זכרון תרועה: by Sep. rendered μνημοσυνον σαλπιγων—Vulg. *memoriale clangentibus tubis*; from whom our Engliſh verſion: " a memorial of " blowing of trumpets." But there is no *trumpet* in the original, as Delgado well remarks; and all the other verſions, ſave the Arabic of Saadias, have words that ſimply denote *ſhouting*, or ſome ſimilar term. Excellently Gr. Ven.: μνημη αλαλαγμου. It may, however, be, that this ſhouting was accompanied with the blowing of *trumpets*, or rather *horns*; and the Alexandrian Gr. tranſlators might, from that uſage in their time, render as they have done. Jerom followed them.

Ver. 36.

Ver. 36. *It is an assembly day.* עצרת הוא. Sep. ἔξοδιον ἐστι—Another Gr. ver. apud Basil. επισυναγωγις—Vulg. *est enim cœtus atque collectæ.* So equivalently Onk. Tharg. Syr. Erp. and Pers.—Sam. ver. עצרה, the Heb. word—Saad. ואמכתוא פי קדסה, *ye must remain at the holy place*—Gr. Ven. κωλυμα ἐστω—Our English version: "it *is* a solemn assembly;" which I take to be the real meaning of the Hebrew, only the word *solemn* is not necessary. Some modern critics, however, are of opinion, that עצרת, from the Arabic עצר *to press*, denotes a festival held when the grapes were to be pressed, or the *wine-press feast.* So Michaëlis and Rosenmüller: but, to me, this appears to be a forced interpretation; and I would rather, with Hezel, follow Sep. and render, *the close of the festival* *; or, as the Scots call the Epiphany, *Uphaly-day*; i. e. the last of the Christmas holidays. But still I prefer *assembly*, as I cannot well see what other term would be so suitable to the context, and as עצרת must be so rendered in several places. See 2 K. 10. 20; Nehem. 8. 18; Isa. 1. 13; Joel, 1. 14.—Dathe has, *Feriæ sunt.* The marginal reading of our public version: "It is a day of re-"straint."

Ver. 40. *Shoots of luxuriant wood.* פרי עץ הדר—Sep. καρπον ξυλου ὡραιου—Vulg. *fructus arboris pulcherrimæ*; and so nearly all the versions, save that some of them, such as Onk. Syr. and Saadias, determine the fruit to have been *citrons*, or *oranges*; and so Josephus expresses it. But whatever might be the usage in the days of Josephus, or the practice of more modern Jews, it is not probable that the *citron-tree* was known either in Egypt or Palestine so early as the age of Moses. See Hezel's excellent note on this place.—The Israelites might take the *fruit*, or *shoots*, here mentioned from any *goodly*, or, as I render, *luxuriant*, tree.—For the rest, I am inclined to think that פרי here means not *fruit*, properly so called, but young growing *shoots*, or *boughs* †, as in our public version; although Delgado finds fault with it on that account, and although the bulk of commentators are on his side. Houbigant, however, has *surculos*, and Junius has *termetes*; but Dathe, *mala citria*, and Michaëlis, "citronen."

CHAP. XXIV.

Ver. 6. *IN two piles.* שתים מערכות. Sep. δυο θεματα. Jerom renders the whole verse thus: "Quorum senos *altrinsecus* super mensam purissimam coram Domino statues;" an ambiguous paraphrase, rendered still more ambiguous in the Douay translation: "which thou "shalt set six one against another upon the most cleane table before the Lord ‡."—There is, indeed, some seeming ambiguity in the text itself, as it is not very clear whether the loaves were to be arranged in *rows* along the table, or in upright *piles* upon the table. But the size of the loaves, and the small length of the table, appear to be decisive for the upright piles; and a better version than that of Sep. cannot be given. The loaves, then, were placed in two piles, each pile containing six loaves.

Ver. 7. In Explan. Note I have said, that perhaps the uppermost loaf of each pile was

* So our Matthew: "It is the end of the feast." † So in the text; but, in the margin, *fruit*.
‡ Or, as in Chaloner's revision, "And thou shalt set them, six and six, one against another," &c.

burned

burned with the incenſe and ſalt, which *ſalt* I have added partly on the authority of Sep. and partly becauſe in ch. 2. 13. all *donatives* are ordered to be *ſeaſoned with ſalt*. Now the *preſence-loaves* may, I think, be conſidered as a ſort of *donative*, out of which a portion was to be burned upon the altar; and in ver. 9 it is expreſsly ſaid, that thoſe loaves were given to Aaron and his ſons, as their ſhare of the Lord's burnt-offerings, מאשי יהוה.—I know that ללחם, in ver. 7, may be rendered, *in lieu of bread* or *food, vice panis*; or, as Dathe, *quæ panis loco ſit**: but this is certainly not the moſt natural interpretation; it is more probable that לחם here has the ſame meaning with בריה in ch. 2. 13. and that ללחם יהוה means, *for the Lord's portion of food*, whether it were the incenſe and ſalt only, or theſe together with two of the loaves.

Ver. 11. *Having mentioned the name* of the Lord. The Heb. has only ויקב השם, *nuncupavit nomen*. Sep. επονομασας το ονομα—Vulg. *cum blaſphemâſſet nomen*; and ſo, indefinitely, all the other verſions, except that the Bab. Tharg. tells us that it was *the great and venerable name which had been heard at Sinai*, ית שמא רבא קירא דמתפרש דשמע בסיני; and it is the general opinion of the Jewiſh interpreters that *Jehovah* is here to be underſtood. This notion I have followed in my verſion, although I confeſs it is not indiſputable. Houbigant has combated it with ſome ſpecious arguments: "Si Dei nomen homo Ægyptius blaſphemavit, vel id nomen "fuit a ſcribis, non a Moſe prætermiſſum; vel שם nudè poſitum idem valet ac יהוה. Id vero "ultimum ex ſacris paginis non vincetur; in quibus nuſquam videas שם, ſolitariè uſurpatum, "pro יהוה, vel pro שם יהוה. Nam ſoli Judæi Rabbini ſcriptis in ſuis uſurpant talem ſcribendi "formam. Jam hominem Ægyptium blaſphemâſſe Dei nomen, Dei inquam Iſraelitarum, "non ſui, parum credibile videtur. Nam cum poſt narretur, eum hominem fuiſſe in cuſto-"diam traditum, donec Moſes ex Deo reſciret, quomodo in eum animadverſum eſſe opor-"teret, quis credat Dei verbis indiguiſſe Moſen, in blaſphemiæ ſupremi numinis crimine "deprehenſo et palam facto? Aiunt quidem novi interpretes, nondum certam pœnam blaſ-"phemis fuiſſe conſtitutam. Sit ita ſanè: an idcircò dubitârit Moſes, hominem in Deum "blaſphemum ultimo delere ſupplicio? Ante hæc tempora fuerat ſancitum, ut ſi quis patri "vel matri male diceret, morte damnaretur: quanto erat morte dignior, qui Deo male-"dixiſſet? Quod ſi dixeris, ideo dubitâſſe Moſen, qui is homo non quidem Deo maledixiſſet, "ſed Dei nomen adverſario maledicendo uſurpâſſet, reclamat lex ver. 15. *Si quis Deum ſuum* "*blaſphemaverit*; ſanciens contra eum qui Deum ipſum ſuum blaſphemiâ laceſſivit. Nam ex "ſanctione ipſa ſanciendæ legis occaſio, qualis fuerit, internoſcitur. His animadverſis, ſu-"pereſt ut is homo blaſphemus in Deum fuerit, ſed ſuum; atque ut ob id eam ipſam cauſam "Moſes anceps fuerit, de tali numinis, quamquam falſi, contemptu, quid eſſet ſtatuendum, "et ut propter eandem cauſam narrârit, hominem eum fuiſſe patris Ægyptii filium, eò ut "intelligeretur fuiſſe eum religione tali, quali naſcendi origine. Quare ver. 15 ſancitur *Si* "*quis Deum ſuum blaſphemaverit, portabit peccatum ſuum.* Quod ne credas in Deo tantum "vero ſancitum, altera lex continuò ſubditur *Qui autem blaſphemârit nomen Domini, morte affi-*"*cietur.* In qua ultima lege blaſphemia in ſupremum numen tangitur; quo modo in priori "blaſphemia in Deum qualemcunque, quem tu cùm colas, tamen ei maledicas; non modò

* Michaëlis: "Dis iſt die ſpeiſe und das opfer für Jehova."

"ne

" ne longiùs dimanet exempli talis contagio, ſed quia id fiebat conſcientiâ judice et accuſatrice. " Ille autem homo extra caſtra educitur, lapidatione interficiendus; non item qui verum " Deum blaſphemat, ut eductio ipſa extra caſtra ſignificet, de ejus blaſphemia nihil pertinere " ad Dei veri cultores.—Nunc quæres, quid fiet de verbo השם, quod deum nec verum nec " falſum demonſtret? Credo equidem id vocabulum, ſeu rectè ſeu corruptè id ſcriptum " habemus, indicâſſe deum quemdam Ægyptiorum; niſi fortè ſcribæ nomen dei falſi, quem " non nôſſent, omiſerint. Ait quidem Caſtellus, vocabulum שם ſignificare apud Samaritanos " *Deum:* quod ſi eſſet, legi poſſet שמו *Deum ſuum.* Sed poteſtatem inducit Caſtellus parùm " teſtatam. Nam quæ duo exempla profert, unum *Exod.* 34. 5. alterum *Deut.* 28. 58. in " priori lacunam fecêre Londinenſes, quia poſt שם abeſt יהוה in Sam. verſione: in poſteriori " malè interpres Samarita verbum Heb. שם interpretatur per nomen יהוה; cùm id nomen in " contextu Heb. Moſe ſequatur: vide, ſi juvat, Polyglotta ad duos locos ſupradictos."—Thus Houbigant, whoſe reaſonings will to ſome, I doubt not, appear extremely plauſible, but which are, for the moſt part, but ſpecious inferences from queſtionable premiſes. The only thing that looks like a ſolid argument is derived from the apparent diſtinction which is made in verſes 15 and 16; of which, preſently. Meanwhile, I think it clear that, in verſe 11, השם, *the name*, (κατ' εξοχην,) is equivalent to *Jehovah*; which, however, I believe to have ſtood originally in the text here, as it ſtill does in ver. 16; although its eliſion muſt have been made at an early period, as it is wanting in Sep. and in the Sam. text.

Ver. 15. *Whoſoever revileth his God, let him bear his ſin.* איש איש כי יקלל אלהיו ונשא חטאו. The queſtion here is, What is meant by אלהיו? Some think that it means not any God, but the *judges*, or *magiſtrates*. So Druſius, Le Clerc, and Roſenmüller: " *Quicunque magiſtratibus* " *ſuis imprecatus fuerit, pœnas peccati ferre debet:* אלהים hic ſignificat *magiſtratus*, ut Exod. 28. " nam de Deo eſt verſ. ſeq. Nexus cogitationum in hoc et ſequenti verſ. eſt hic: Si jam " is, qui magiſtratibus ſuis maledixerit, pœnas luere debet; tanto magis plectendus eſt is qui " tale crimen erga Deum commiſerit."—But I believe no one, who has read the whole context with attention, will be ready to adopt this opinion. What gives riſe to the injunction is not the reviling a magiſtrate, but reviling *the name* of ſome god or other: the injunction, therefore, muſt be relative to this alone. But, ſtill, what is meant here by *his God?* Any one's own god, (ſay ſome interpreters,) whether a falſe god or a true God *. So Schulz: " Quicunque Deo ſuo, ſive *verus* ſive *falſus* is ſit, maledixerit pœnam luat."—This interpretation I conſider as more inadmiſſible than even the former; for, is it in the ſmalleſt degree credible that the Lord *Jehovah*, or Moſes in his name, would announce to the Iſraelites (for to them the law is addreſſed) that reviling even a falſe god was a crime worthy of puniſhment? He who takes every occaſion to place all gods, except the God of Iſrael, in the moſt contemptible point of view!—But how, then, account for the contraſt between verſes 15 and 16? There is no contraſt, but a moſt proper climax. In verſe 15 is a general precept, forbidding every Iſraelite to revile his God under any name whatſoever; but the reviling him under the appellation of his great name JEHOVAH is to be puniſhed with immediate death, and by the ſame ſort of death as had been juſt inflicted upon the Ægyptian proſelyte, who

* Philo was of this opinion,

had

had reviled *that* NAME, השם.—It is remarkable that in ver. 16 the ſame *ellipſis* occurs as in ver. 11, בנקבו שם יומת, where the Sam. copy has השם, as in ver. 11; for the prefix is here of importance. This repetition of השם, without any adjunct*, overturns Houbigant's reaſoning on the השם of ver. 11; for here it can refer only to Jehovah, the God of Iſrael.

CHAP. XXV.

Ver. 5. *THE grapes that grow without pruning.* את ענבי נזיריך; by Montanus literally rendered *uvas ſeparationum tuarum.*—The antient tranſlators conjecture variouſly. Sep. *την σταφυλην του αγιασματος σου*—Vulg. *uvas primitiarum tuarum*—Onk. ית ענבי שבקך—Tharg. ית ענבי רדופיכון—Syr. ענבא דשבשתיכון—Sam. ver. ענבי כליליך—Saad. אלפארד מן ענבך—Erp. ענב תרכאנך—Perſ. אנטרהאי רזי תו—Gr. Ven. *τας ςαφυλας του αγεωργητου σου.*—The difficulty lies in aſcertaining the meaning of the word נזיר. Le Clerc imagined that it was here to be taken in the ſame ſenſe with נזיר, *a Nazarite:* "Vocat נזיר *vineam non putatam*, tranſlatione a Naziræo "ductâ; cujus per Nazireatûs tempus ut cæſaries non tondebatur, ſic palmites, qui ſunt "comæ vitis, ſeptimo anno non putabantur." This explanation, although ſcouted by Houbigant, was adopted by Michaëlis, and again rejected by Roſenmüller, who gives his own interpretation in the following words: "Equidem נזיריך in eodem ſenſu, quo Clericus, ſumo; "ſed id exponere mallem *vineam a qua ſeparaſti te, dum eam non coluiſti*; vineam non cultam "ſive putatam: igitur ענבי נזיריך erunt *uvæ quæ naſcuntur in vineis tuis, ſeptimo anno, non* "*putatis.*"—That this is the general meaning of the comma I have little doubt; but I differ from both Le Clerc and Roſenmüller as to the preciſe ſignification of the word נזיר here. I think it has nothing to do with the common acceptations of נזר, not even with נזיר, *a Nazarite*; but I would refer it either with Houbigant to נצר, a branch, *ſurculus*, or rather to the Arab. נדר, *viruit, fronduit—comam produxit* arbor. See Caſtell.—The Syr. tranſlator ſeems then very properly to have rendered, and his verſion was with reaſon adopted by Houbigant: *nec racemos palmitum tuorum decerpes.* But he commits a double miſtake in his note; 1ſt, by writing the Syr. term דשבקתיכון inſtead of דשבשתיכון, and 2dly, by aſſigning to the שבק of Onk. the ſame ſignification. It is true that עבד שבקין is found in the Chald. paraphraſe on Ezek. 17. 6; but Elias Levita juſtly remarks, that שבשין ſeems to be the true reading; and of this, indeed, I have no doubt.—For the reſt, the true reading in the comma which has been the ſubject of this remark is נזיריך in the plural; which is that of Sam. 12 Heb. MSS. Vulg. Syr. and P. P. ver. 11.

Ver. 10. *A year of jubilee.* The preciſe meaning of the word יובל is not well aſcertained. Onk. Tharg. and Perſ. retain the Hebrew term, which Vulg. only Latinizes, *Quia jubilæus eſt*; but Sep. *αφεσεως σημασια*, and ſo equivalently both Arabs; and the פוניא of Syr. comes to the ſame point. The idea ſeems to be drawn from the conſequences that attended the

* In Sep. indeed, there is *το ονομα κυριον*; as if they had read in their copy השם יהוה. And ſo Vulg.: *nomen Domini.* But all the other verſions have only *the name.* Yet I have little doubt that יהוה was originally in the text in both places, if the original text be ſo old as Moſes, or even as Solomon; for the rabbinical ſcruple of not writing or pronouncing the name *Jehovah* is of a much poſterior date.

jubilee rather than from the etymon of the word, which denotes the *trumpet*, or *horn*, by which the jubilee was announced: hence the Gr. Ven. has κερας τελεσει ὑμιν. Some, however, would derive יובל from the Syr. יבל, *deferre, deducere:* but why not, as well, from the Hebrew root itſelf, in the ſignification of *transferre?*—It may be worth obſerving here, that the jubilee of the Jews gave riſe to the papal jubilee, or year of *plenary indulgence*, as it is termed, firſt inſtituted by Boniface VIII. and fixed at a period of one hundred years; but reduced to fifty by Clement VI. to thirty-three by Urban VI. and at laſt to twenty-five by Sixtus IV. in 1475.

Ver. 30. *That is in a walled city.* The preſent Heb. text has אשר לא חמה, which made the Maſoretic Ainſworth render, "in the city that hath *not* a wall." But James's tranſlators did right to follow the *Keri* reading לו, which is that of Sam. 15 Heb. MSS. and of all the antient verſions.

Ver. 33. This verſe runs thus in the preſent Heb. and Sam.: ואשר יגאל מן הלוים ויצא ממכר בית ועיר אחזתו; by our Engliſh tranſlators rendered, "And if a man purchaſe of the Levites, "then the houſe that was ſold, and the city of his poſſeſſion, &c." But this is inconſiſtent with the context, and different ways have been taken to amend the paſſage. Houbigant, finding in the Vulg. "ſi redemptæ *non* fuerint," &c. imagined that Jerom had read, in his Hebrew copy, לא before יגאל, and accordingly adopted that reading in his verſion, "Quare "aliquam domum ſi quis Levita *non* redemerit, irrita erit in Jubilæo venditio domûs ejus." But this cannot be the meaning of the legiſlator, and is contrary to the whole tenor of the laws in favour of the Levites. It is not, therefore, here, but in the following part of the verſe, where the error lies, but which is rectified by the Septuagint, who read not ועיר, but העיר, which, I have no doubt, was the original reading, and which ſets all right: only אשר יגאל מן הלוים muſt not be rendered "If a man purchaſe of (i. e. from) the Levites," but "If it be any of the Levites," &c.; *Qui ex Levitis.* So Dathe: "Sed ſi, qui "redemerit, *ſit de Levitis*, ceſſat jus domûs venditæ *in urbe* quam Levitæ poſſident "anno jubilæo."—Michaëlis: "Und wenn ein Levite das haus ſeines verwandten durch "den wiederkauf an ſich bringt, ſo wird auch das verkaufte haus im Jubeliahr wieder "frey," &c.

Ver. 35—38. Theſe laws concerning *uſury* would be abſurd in a commercial nation; but the Hebrew republic was not intended to be a commercial nation, and the laws againſt *uſury* ſeem to be well calculated for the general good of the community. See Michaëlis's *Moſaiſches Recht.* vol. iii. ſect. 154. or his *Comment. de mente ac ratione legis Moſaicæ uſuram prohibentis*, printed with other diſſertations at Göttingen in 1767.

CHAP. XXVI.

Ver. 1. *FOR the purpoſe of adoring at them.* להשתחות עליה; commonly rendered, as in our public verſion, "to bow down to it." So Sep. προσκυνησαι αυτῳ; and Vulg. *ut adoratis eum.* I cannot think that this is the meaning. The prepoſition על after the verb שחה never, elſewhere, precedes the object of adoration. See Gen. 47. 31; 1 K. 1. 47; 2 Chron. 7. 3;

If.

Iſ. 60. 14; Ezek. 46. 2; Zophon. 1. 4. It every where, in ſuch conſtruction, ſignifies either *upon*, *towards*, or *at*: and here both the Erpenian Arab and the Perſic tranſlator have well rendered, the former by עלידא, the latter כהדך *versùs*. Even Gr. Ven. has *επ' αυτου*.

Ver. 5. Jarhi's note on this verſe is excellent: "Nam erit tritura copioſa; voſque in illa "occupati eritis uſque ad vindemiam, et in vindemia eritis occupati uſque ad tempus ſationis." Shakſpeare has imitated this in the Tempeſt, where the wiſh of Ceres is,

Spring come to you, at the fartheſt,
In the very end of harveſt!

Ver. 13. *The bands of your yoke.* מטות עולכם. Sep. *τον δεσμον τε ζυγε υμων*—Vulg. *catenas cervicum veſtrarum*.—מטה, or מט, was a *rod*, or *bar*, bent into an oval form to fit it for the ox's neck, the two ends of which, paſſing through the wooden yoke, were kept faſt to it by pins.

Ver. 16. *With diſeaſes.* The preſent Heb. text has בהלה, by our Engliſh tranſlators rendered *terrour*, as if the word were from בהל. So alſo Jerom underſtood it, but in a different ſenſe: "vi-"ſitabo vos *velociter**." I am perſuaded that the true reading is that of Sam. בחלה; but do not think, with Houbigant, that ב is here a prepoſition, or that the root is חלה. I believe the root to be בחל, and the meaning of בחלה to be a *nauſea*, which for the moſt part precedes a *conſumption*. I am perſuaded that this was the reading of Sep. and not בלהה, as Houbigant imagined. Their *απορια* is, in my opinion, wrongly rendered *egeſtas*; I think it expreſſes that *debility* and *diſquietude* which accompany a *nauſea*; for, although they nowhere elſe render בחלה by *απορια*, they employ the latter to expreſs ſimilar terms. Thus, Deut. 28. 22. שחפת is rendered *απορια*. In like manner they employ the verb *απορεω* to expreſs the Heb. דוי, *languidus*, Jerem. 8. 18; and יצר, *angor*, Gen. 32. 7. Nay, in Zach. 11. 8. the word in queſtion, בחלה, as a verb, muſt, I think, have been rendered in Sep. by *ηπορεωντο*. What ſenſe can be made out of any of the preſent readings, *επορευοντο*, *επωρυοντο*, or *επωροουτο*?—Were we to truſt the Latin tranſlator of Syr. we ſhould claſs him with Sep. and Sam.; but I doubt if תחרא will bear to be rendered *phthiſis*, or even *debilitas*, as in Caſtell; and I think that Syr. read בהלה in his copy, as well as all the other antient interpreters whoſe verſions remain; for we have loſt thoſe of Aquila, Theod. and Sym.; ſo we cannot tell what word they read.

Ib. *Conſumptions.* השחפת. Sep. *ψωραν*—Vulg. *in egeſtate*; and ſo equivalently Onk.: but both Arabs and Perſ. have words that denote a *conſumption*: and this I take to be the true meaning of שחפת. See the Arabic سحف in Caſtell or Golius.

Ib. *Fevers.* הקדחת. Sep. *οιτερα*—Vulg. *ardor*; and ſo equivalently Onk. Tharg. Perſ. and Saad. Even Gr. Ven. has *τον πυρετον*. There is little doubt that it means a *burning fever*, from קדח, *exardeſcere*. Jarhi: "Dictio denotat morbum qui inflammat corpus, idque calidum "et tumidum reddit." The effects of the conſumption and of the fever are beautifully contraſted in theſe words: מכלות עינים ומדיבות נפש; which I render, *ſhall waſte your eyes and wring your hearts*. See Explan. Note.

Ver. 22. *Which ſhall rob you of your children.* ושכלה אתכם. Lit. *ſhall bereave you.* Sep.

* So likewiſe Saadias.

and Jerom ſeem to have read אמלה, or perhaps שללה, as the former have καταδιωξας, the latter *conſumant*. But all the other verſions follow the preſent reading.—Gr. Ven. has very properly και αποκτενουσιν υμας.

Ver. 30. *Tutelar ſtatues.* חמני. Sep. ξυλινα χειροποιητα—Vulg. *ſimulacra*—Onk. חניסנטי—Syr. דחלת—Sam. ver. retains the Heb. word—Saad. אנדאד—Erp. שטטאת—Perſ. אפתאב ו׳אמדאי, *ſun-houſes*—Gr. Ven. αναβασεις.—The learned reader will readily perceive that almoſt all theſe verſions are vague conjectures. The Heb. word is generally claſſed under the root חמם; and becauſe חם ſignifies *heat*, and becauſe the ſun is the ſource of heat, חמן is ſuppoſed to ſignify a *ſolar ſtatue*, that is, an obeliſk dedicated to the ſun. I am apt to think that the true meaning of the word is to be ſought in the Arab. חמא, *to protect*; and that חמנים were ſtatues erected to the *genii protectores*, or *tutelar gods*. See Kircher Oedip. I. 173.—However, as the other opinion is not without probability, and is at preſent more generally received, I would eraſe *tutelar ſtatues*, and write here *ſun-images*, as in 2 Chron. 14. 5.

Ib. *On the careaſes of your idols.* The Heb. word rendered *carcaſes* is the ſame as is uſed in the next comma, פגרי; but here it muſt be taken in a metaphorical ſenſe, denoting the *fragments*, or *ſtumps*, of the idols.

Ver. 31. *Your ſanctuary.* The preſent Heb. has מקדשיכם, *your ſanctuaries*; and ſo ſeem to have read Sep. Vulg. Onk. Saad. and Gr. Ven. Hence ſome moderns interpret the word as meaning ſanctuaries dedicated to profane divinities. But this, I think, cannot be the meaning, whether we read in the plural * or in the ſingular; which latter, מקדשכם, is the reading of Sam. Syr. Erp. Perſ. and of not leſs than 50 Heb. and 2 Chald. MSS. To which join the Complutenſian edition of Heb. and 4 editions of Onkelos. Comp. Pſ. 74. 7. and Ezek. 9. 6.

Ver. 39. ‖*Their enemies*; for, hither the mark ‖ ſhould be removed, and *their* written for *your*. The preſent Heb. indeed has *your enemies*, איביכם; and ſo Onk.‖ and Perſ.—But Sam. Sep. Sym. Theod. Vulg. Syr. both Arabs †, and even Gr. Ven. with above 80 Hebrew MSS. and ſeveral of the oldeſt editions, have *their enemies*, איבידם; ſo that there is little doubt of this being the genuine reading.—For the reſt, there ſeems to be a miſarrangement in the preſent text, which was not in the copy of the Septuagint, who thus render the verſe: Και οι καταλειφθεντες αφ' υμων καταφθαρησονται δια τας αμαρτιας αυτων, και δια τας αμαρτιας των πατερων αυτων· εν τη γη των εχθρων αυτων τακησονται. This appears to be the more natural order, which I have followed in my verſion. Compare the order in the next verſe.

Verſes 40, 41. I have ſaid, in Explan. Note, that the ſenſe of this paſſage is ſtrangely confounded in almoſt all the verſions. I ſhall content myſelf with giving three examples.—Sep. Και εξαγορευσουσι τας αμαρτιας αυτων, και τας αμαρτιας των πατερων αυτων, οτι παρεβησαν και υπερειδον με, και οτι επορευθησαν εναντιον μου πλαγιοι, και εγω επορευθην μετ' αυτων εν θυμῳ πλαγιῳ, και απωλιω αυτους εν τη γη των εχθρων αυτων· τοτε εντραπησεται η καρδια αυτων η απεριτμητος, και τοτε ευδοκησουσι τας αμαρτιας αυτων· και, κ. τ. λ.—Vulg. *Donec confiteantur iniquitates ſuas et majorum ſuorum, quibus prevaricati ſunt in me, et ambulaverunt ex adverſo mihi. Ambulabo igitur et ego*

* The Septuagint render not αγιαστηρια, but αγια, by which they more frequently expreſs the ſanctuary, מקוש; ſo that it is uncertain whether they read here מקושי or מקוש. Gr. Ven. has likewiſe τα ιερα, not τα αγιασματα, the word by which he is wont to render מקוש.

‖ I mean in the printed text, for not leſs than 18 MSS. have the other reading. See De Roſſi.

† Beſide the Rutilian Arab, and the Barberini Arab. Sam.

contra

contra eos, et inducam illos in terram hoſtilem, donec erubeſcat incircumciſa mens eorum: tunc orabunt pro impietatibus ſuis.—Common Engliſh verſion: "If they ſhall confeſs ‖ their iniquity "and [the iniquity of their fathers, with their treſpaſs which they treſpaſſed againſt me, and "that alſo they have walked contrary unto me; and *that* I alſo have walked contrary unto "them, and have brought them into the land of their enemies; if then their uncircumciſed "hearts be humbled, and they then accept of the puniſhment of their iniquity: then, &c." —Now, none of theſe verſions, in my opinion, expreſs the real meaning of the original. The firſt of them is the leaſt exceptionable; as by the change of a ſingle word, the fut. απολω into the aoriſt, and by giving to και before εγω επορευθην the meaning of δια τουτο, which I think it will bear, and then by conſidering και εγω and what follows to εχθρων αυτων incluſively as a parentheſis, all will be clear and conſecutive.—The Vulgate, as it ſtands, is irremediable; nor do I find any variety of lection either in Hentennius, or any copy that I have ſeen. The verſion of the Vulg. was, however, followed by our firſt tranſlators, even down to the Genevans, who all render אלך and הבאתי in the future. But James's reviſers ſaw the impropriety of this, and tried to remove it thus. They make the firſt colon of ver. 41 a part of the confeſſion of the people in their diſtreſs *; and, to connect it with ver. 40, thruſt in an Italic *that*, and render both the verbs juſt now mentioned in the præterite. This, at firſt ſight, ſeems to reconcile the Text with itſelf; but I am perſuaded it is not the true meaning of the text; for, what need was there to *confeſs* that the Lord had *walked contrary to them, and had brought them into the land of their enemies*, when they are already ſuppoſed to be in the land of their enemies, and under the Lord's rod of affliction?—Of all the antient tranſlators, Tawuſi alone ſeems to have underſtood his original; his Perſic verſion of ver. 41 being מיז מן בוים אואי אישא דר סתיזה, &c. Among moderns, the verſion of Houbigant comes neareſt to the point; and would, with very little variation, be perfectly clear: "Tandem [ſi] peccatum "ſuum et parentum ipſorum confitebuntur [confeſſi fuerint], quo ipſi et patres eorum me "offenderunt, et iram meam [ita] provocaverunt, ut ego, eis infenſus, in terram hoſtium "ipſorum eos deportarem, &c."—This, I think, is undoubtedly the meaning; but, for the ſake of greater perſpicuity, I judged it better to include in a parentheſis the words that create the difficulty; and leave to the ſagacious critic to ſay, whether the context does not require ſuch a rendering.

CHAP. XXVII.

Ver. 2. *IF any one will diſtinguiſh himſelf*, &c. איש כי יפלא נדר בערכך בפשות ליהוה; rendered by Montanus thus: "Vir cum ſeparaverit votum in ordinatione tua animarum Domino."—Sed quis hæc intelliget? Nemo, Hercule! nemo.—Nor much more intelligible is our common verſion: "When a man ſhall make a ſingular vow, the perſons ſhall be for the Lord by thy "eſtimation."—By whoſe eſtimation? "By that of Moſes," ſay ſome; "By that of the "prieſt for the time being," ſay others. But the words are addreſſed neither to Moſes nor to

‖ It is remarkable, that, in the earlier editions, theſe three words are wanting; but inſerted in poſterior editions.

* In this they had been preceded by Caſtalio, Junius, Piſcator, the Tigurines, and others.

the

the prieſt; but to the children of Iſrael. To apply the ערכך to either the prieſt or Moſes, then, is confounding ideas, and introducing an *anacoluthon*, to which, I believe, there is no parallel.—But let us turn to the antient interpreters; who are, at leaſt, conſiſtent. Sep. Ὁς αν ευξηται ευχην ὡςε τιμην της ψυχης εαυτου * τῳ κυριῳ—Vulg. *Homo qui votum fecerit, et ſponderit Deo animam ſuam, ſub eſtimatione dabit pretium.* So equivalently Onk. Tharg. and both Arabs, who all conſidered the ך final as a paragogic letter, or underſtood the word imperſonally, as I do. Delgado's note is judicious: "The Heb. ſubſtantive ערך, *eſtimation* or "*value*, is never found in Scripture but with the pronoun of the ſecond perſon joined to it; "and which is an *expletive*, having no uſe but to diſtinguiſh it from the meaning of an ordi-"nance, or laying in order."—Houbigant's verſion is, *quarum æſtimatio ſit habenda.* But better, perhaps, that of Dathe: "Si quis votum fecerit, quod homines ſpectat, *æſtimari de-*"*bent*, &c."†—I have given a ſomewhat different turn to the colon, which, I am perſuaded, gives the true meaning.—For the reſt, in rendering the word יפלא, I have followed Aquila and Theod. who have θαυμαςωση.

For the political reaſons for the varieties in the valuation, ſee Michaëlis's *Moſaiſches Recht.* vol. ii. ſect. 124.

Ver. 16. *An homer of barley-ſeed.* The word *homer* is never to be confounded with *omer*; or, as others write it, *gomer*; the Heb. term for the latter being עמר with an *ain*, of the former, חמר with a *heth*.—An *homer* was a meaſure containing ten *ephas*. See the Table of Meaſures.

Ver. 29. *No man, even, who hath been ſo devoted, may be redeemed: he ſhall ſurely be put to death.* כל חרם אשר יחרם מן האדם לא יפדה מות יומת. Sep. Παν [ανατθημα] ὁ εαν ανατεθη απο των ανθρωπων, ου λυτρωθησεται, αλλα θανατῳ θανατωθησεται—Vulg. *Omnis conſecratio, quæ offertur ab homine, non redimetur; ſed morte morietur.* And ſo, equivalently, all the ant. tranſlators down to Gr. Ven. who very literally and ſtrongly renders thus: Παν ανατθημα, ὁπερ ανατθειη απ' ανθρωπων, ου λυτρωθησεται, τῳ θνησκειν θανατουσθω. That the Heb. words will bear no other meaning is to me as clear as meridian light; and, indeed, it is but of late that any other meaning has been attempted to be forced upon them. We are, however, now gravely told, that מות יומת ſignifies not *that he ſhall be put to death*, but *that he ſhall remain dedicated to the Lord's ſervice until the day of his death.* If any one can put up with this interpretation, he may.

A ſomewhat more plauſible way of getting rid of the difficulty is, to ſay that the perſons here ordered to be put to death were only ſuch as had been otherwiſe devoted to utter deſtruction, ſuch as the Chanaanites. So Houbigant: "Non alios licebat anathemate voveri, quam "Chananæos, quos juſſerat Deus ad internecionem deleri."—So, likewiſe, Roſenmüller: "In-"telligendus ſine dubio hoſtis in bello internecioni devotus .... nam ſervos aut liberos aut alios "innocuos homines devovere non multum differret a crudeli conſuetudine eorum, qui victimas "humanas mactarent: quod Moſes graviter damnat Deut. 12. 31." But even this interpretation is forced, and inadmiſſible. There is not a ſingle word of Chanaanites, or other ene-

* Houbigant thinks they read נפשו: but there is no need of ſo ſuppoſing; they probably read as we now do, but conſidered *ſouls* here as equivalent to any *one* individual of *many ſouls*. † I wonder that Michaëlis and Roſenmüller were here guided by Le Clerc.

mies,

mics, in this whole chapter; and the חרם, or *devoting to death*, here mentioned, evidently regards perſons of any kind belonging to the man who chooſes to devote them.—More rational and ſpecious is the explication of Capellus, which I have partly expreſſed in my Explanatory Note. It was, he thinks, like the law about divorce. God did not approve divorces; but, on account of the hardneſs of the Jews' hearts, permitted a man to divorce his wife, when he was of ſuch a temper that he would not live with her. Juſt ſo, although God did not abſolutely approve of any one's being devoted to death; yet, to prevent ſuch raſh vows, he would, if they were made, have them fulfilled.—" But," ſays a deceaſed friend of mine, in a MS. note, " I can never conceive that God commanded one man to be killed, " becauſe another had made a raſh vow." Neither can I conceive it. But the queſtion is not, what we conceive, but what is the preciſe meaning of the law. Now I affirm that it can have no other meaning than that which is given in our common verſion, namely, that the perſon *devoted* by what is termed חרם, *herem*, was abſolutely to be put to death. That the Iſraelites themſelves underſtood it in this light, is clear from the caſe of Jephthah; for it is an abſurd interpretation to ſay that his daughter was not to be ſacrificed, but only condemned to the ſervice of the tabernacle, and a life of virginity; as I ſhall ſhow in due time and place. Meanwhile I will repeat, that the word חרם has never any other meaning than *utter deſtruction*, whether it regard a ſingle perſon or whole nations; nor can any example be produced where it will bear a milder interpretation.

But it will be urged, Is not this altogether contrary to Levit. 18. 21. and 20. 2. and more eſpecially to Deut. 12. 31? To this I anſwer, that I am not obliged to reconcile contradictions, whereſoever they may be found. Yet let us ſee whether the paſſages be ſo irreconcileable as they may at firſt ſight appear. In both places of Levit. the Iſraelites are forbidden, under pain of death, to devote their offspring to *Moloch*; but there is no prohibition to devote them to *Jehovah*. In Deut. indeed the injunction is clearer: it forbids imitating thoſe nations who, in honour of their gods, burned their own children; and declares that this practice *is moſt abominable and hateful to the Lord*. Is this to be conſidered as a formal repeal of the injunction in Levit. 27. 29? Or is it abſolutely compatible with it? Are *children* virtually excepted in the law of Levit.? Or does the law of Deut. abrogate the whole of the former? Or, in fine, is it only the *mode* of *devoting* that is forbidden in Deut.?—I have fairly ſtated the caſe, and leave every one to think of it as he pleaſes.

Ver. 32. *That paſſeth under the* tithing *rod*. אשר יעבר תחת השבט. Sep. ὁ αν ελθη εν τῳ αριθμῳ ὑπο τον ῥαβδον—Vulg. *quæ ſub paſtoris virga tranſeunt*. So alſo Syr. and ſo equivalently all the other verſions. That שבט is here a *rod*, or *ſtaff*, there is little doubt; yet the meaning of the phraſe is diſputed. Dathe, followed by Roſenmüller, thus explains it: " Quæ " in paſtorum cuſtodia aut cura ſunt."—I believe the meaning to be, that the titheman numbered the ſheep, &c. with a rod, and ſeparated each tenth one. I have ſeen ſheep counted in this manner.

NUMBERS. CHAP. I.

IT is diſputed whether the general muſter reported in this chapter be the ſame with that of Exodus 30. 11. and 38. 25. The round number is preciſely the ſame, but the time ſeems different. The muſter mentioned in Exodus muſt have been made in the firſt year from the exit out of Egypt, and before the tabernacle was erected; whereas this is ſaid to have happened in the ſecond month of the ſecond year.—Michaëlis * has laboured to ſhow that there was only one *muſter*, but divided into two *acts*. In Exodus, the people were regiſtered in different tables by their reſpective centurions and decurions, for the purpoſe of levying a poll-tax for the conſtruction of the ſanctuary: but here theſe different regiſters were reduced into one by Moſes and the chiefs of tribes; in doing which, no regard was paid to the diminution or increaſe of numbers that muſt have happened ſince laſt year. Thoſe who had died during that period were ſtill ſuppoſed to be alive; and thoſe who had but juſt arrived at the twentieth year were not counted. This is ingenious; but has no other ſupport than the identity of numbers, which I cannot conſider as a ſolid proof. It is well known that the Hebrew hiſtorians were ſeldom wont to expreſs ſmall numbers; and it is here obſervable that *fifty* is the ſmalleſt number in any of the ſums: and even this number occurs only twice; all the reſt end with *hundreds*. But is it in the ſmalleſt degree probable that none of the numbers ſhould end with forty, thirty, twenty, ten, or even with a ſmaller fraction? I think, not; and therefore believe that round numbers were given to make up a round ſum-total: and this ſum's agreeing with that in Exodus may have been the fruit of deſign, to ſhow that the people had not diminiſhed.—For the reſt, the numbers here, and often elſewhere, ſeem to be greatly exaggerated. Six hundred and three thouſand five hundred and fifty men, beſides the whole tribe of Levi, all the males under the age of twenty, and all the women of every age, (who muſt have amounted to twice the former number at leaſt,) encamped together in the deſert of Sinai, is a thing hardly credible.

Ver. 3. *From the age of twenty years, upward.* Plato, in his *Republic*, makes his males fit for war from the age of twenty to ſixty. The Hebrew legiſlator marks no ultimate period.

Ver. 24. This and the following verſe are in Sep. tranſpoſed to after ver. 37 in all the editions, ſave Compl.; the editors of which appear to have brought them hither in conformity to the Hebrew copies; for all the MSS. which I have yet ſeen agree with the other editions.

Ver. 51. *Any other perſon.* זר; in our common verſion rendered *the ſtranger*; but it here means any one who is not of the tribe of Levi.

Ver. 53. I have, in my verſion, made a ſmall tranſpoſition of the laſt comma of the verſe, for the ſake of perſpicuity; but nothing is changed in the meaning.

* *De cenſibus Hebr. in* Comment. Societatis Regiæ Goetting. Prelectio; and in his *German Notes* on Numbers.

CHAP.

CHAP. II.

Ver. 14. *DEUEL.* דעואל. The common Hebrew text has רעואל, *Reuel*; followed by our vulgar verſion: but Sam. Sep. Vulg. Onk. Tharg. Saad.* with above 100 MSS. and the old edition of Soncino of 1488 †, have *Deuel*; and ſo the name is written ch. 1. 14. and ch. 10. 20.

Ver. 31. *According to their ſtandards.* לדגליהם. Sep. κατα ταγμα (or ταγματα) αυτων.—By Vulg. the word is entirely omitted, as well as by the Latin tranſlator of Onk.; but not by Onk. himſelf, who, with Tharg. has לטקיסיהון *per ordines:* and ſo equivalently Syr. and both Arabs.—Gr. Ven. ταις σημειωις αυτων.—I ſuſpect that לצבאתם was the original reading; but I find no veſtige of it either in Kennicott or De Roſſi.

CHAP. III.

Ver. 1. *THE progeny of Aaron (and of Moſes) were theſe.* I have included *and of Moſes* in a parentheſis, becauſe perhaps it may be an interpolation; yet it is in all the copies of both texts, and in all the verſions, without any variation, ſave that in Saad. it precedes Aaron. The Heb. words are, אלה תולדת אהרן ומשה—Sep. Αυται αι γενεσεις Ααρων και Μωυσῃ—Vulg. *Hæ generationes Aaron et Moyſi*; and ſo equivalently all the other verſions. It is well known that the meaning of the word תולדת is not limited to actual *generation*; it ſometimes ſignifies *progeny*, by *adoption*, as the verb from which it is derived ſignifies *to adopt*. See Deut. 32. 18; Pſ. 2. 7; and Jerem. 2. 27. It alſo ſignifies the *events* that happen in a family; as in Gen. 38. 2: ſo here it may ſignify the occurrences that happened in the family of Moſes and Aaron ‡. Still, however, I am apt to think that the word is here to be taken in its firſt or ſecondary meaning; and that, as I have ſaid in my Explan. Note, the progeny of Aaron is conſidered as the progeny of Moſes alſo; his own ſons being born of a ſtranger. This idea ſeems to have ſtruck the Arabic tranſlator Saadias, who thus renders the comma: הדה נסבה קום מוסי והארון, *This is the progeny of the family of Moſes and Aaron.* Dathe: *Hæc fuit progenies Moſis et Aaronis*—Michaëlis: "Das geſchlechtregiſter Aharons und Moſe ſtand folgender-"maſſen."

Ver. 31. *Their charge was the ark,* &c. One might have expected that this primary and moſt honourable office would be committed to the *Gerſhonites*, as being the elder branch of

* That is, in the Paris and London Polyglotts: for the ed. of Conſtantinople, according to De Roſſi, has *Reuel*; which is alſo the reading of Syr. Arab. Erp. and Perſ. The Greek of Venice has a very ſingular reading, υιευς Εξουελου, if this be not a typographical error. † Beſides a Pentateuch of the fifteenth century, in quarto, and another in folio, mentioned by De Roſſi. ‡ Commodè verti poteſt: *hæc ſunt quæ in familia Aaronis et Moſis "contigerunt*; de iis enim agit totum hoc caput. Vocem autem Hebræam non ſolum *generationes* ſignificare, ſed etiam "*ea quæ in familia aut cognatione aliqua contigerunt*, apparet ex Geneſi 37. 2. Quanquam hìc etiam familia Moſis nomi-"natur, tamen in capite ipſo Aaronis tantummodo familia deſcribitur. Cognatio igitur Moſis et Aaronis tanquam "una conſideratur; et quidquid de Aarone ſcribitur, de Moſe etiam narratur." Roſenmüller in loc.

the progeny of Levi; but Moſes and Aron were *Koathites*, and it was natural for them to prefer their own family *.

Ver. 39. I have excluded from the text the words *and Aaron*, on the authority of Sam. Syr. and 12 MSS. They are, however, in all the other verſions, without excepting Sep. in all the copies which I have ſeen; but it is remarkable that they are wanting in the Coptic verſion made from Sep.; and indeed they are now pretty generally allowed to be an interpolation. Even in the common Maſoretic text the letters are marked with dots above, thus: וְאַהֲרֹן: moſt probably to point out that they were to be conſidered as interlopers. Their extruſion makes this verſe conſiſtent with ver. 5. where only Moſes is commanded to number the Levites.

Ib. *Twenty-two thouſand.* "Here," ſays (very honeſtly) Delgado, "appears a ſeeming "contradiction: the total of the Levites expreſſed here is 22,000; and, ſumming up the "number of particular families, we find them to be 22,300. But the rabbins tell us, from "tradition, that the 300 could not ſerve to ranſom the firſt-born, as they themſelves were "firſt-born."—Such is the Jewiſh ſolution of this difficulty: let us now ſee how Chriſtian interpreters have cut the knot.

De Lyra, Munſter, Oleaſter, Toſtatus, Cajetan, De Muis, Ainſworth, and even Le Clerc, adopt the rabbinical hypotheſis, namely, that neither the firſt-born of the Levites nor the prieſts of the race of Aaron were comprehended in the 22,000 mentioned in ver. 29, although they made a part of the three ſums mentioned in ver. 22, 28, and 34. But this explication is very juſtly exploded by Bonfrerius, who obſerves, that it is incredible, not to ſay impoſſible, that in the number of 22,300 perſons there ſhould be only 300 firſt-born.

Others, among whom Houbigant and Michaëlis, account for the preſent difference thus: they ſuppoſe that, in ver. 28, where the ſum of the Koathites is given, the original reading was not שש מאות 600, but שלש מאות 300. The lapſe was certainly eaſy, and the conjecture has every degree of probability which a conjecture can well have. It is enhanced even by the diſproportion of the preſent ſum of the Koathites, 8,600, exceeding ſo much the other two, 7,500 and 6,200.

Dr. Kennicott took another method, but of a ſimilar kind. He conjectured that the number had been changed, ver. 22, in the number of the Gerſhonites; and that inſtead of 500 we ſhould read 200. But, beſides that this reduces too low the proportionate number of Gerſhonites, the conjecture is founded on an uncertain hypotheſis that the Hebrew hiſtorian expreſſed numbers by ſingle letters; and here wrote ר *reſh* inſtead of ך or *caph* final †. This ſolution is therefore given up, I believe, by almoſt all latter critics.—The conjecture of Houbigant is far more natural; yet as all the copies, both Heb. and Sam. as well as all the verſions, have in ver. 28 the ſame number, 8,600 ‡, it has been attempted to reconcile the num-

* "Cujus rei ratio ſine dubio hæc fuit, quod Moſes et Aaron ex ea Caathitarum familia eſſent." Roſenmüller.

† This too is againſt Kennicott's hypotheſis; for I am perſuaded there were no final *caphs* in original copies; nor is there an inſtance, I believe, where the Greek tranſlators miſtook a *reſh* for a *caph*, or *vice verſa*; which they might readily have done if the final *caph* had then exiſted, as they have often done with regard to *reſh* and *daleth*. There is no final *caph* in the Sam. alphabet. ‡ It is a miſtake in Schulz to ſay, "Pro שש legerunt Septuaginta שלש." They have, uniformly, οκταχισχιλιοι και εξακοσιοι; and the Coptic verſion has the ſame number.

bers

bers in the following manner. In the firſt place, it is laid down as a poſtulate that the number in ver. 39 cannot be 22,300, for this reaſon, that it would be greater than the number of the firſt born of the other tribes, 22,273; which ſum is, in ver. 46, ſaid to be leſs than the firſt-born of the Levites, by 273; therefore the ſum 22,000, in ver. 39, is the true ſum.—This will be readily granted; but how is this ſum to be reconciled with the ſum of the Koathites, in ver. 28?—Why thus: The ſurplus of 300 Levites, ariſing from the three ſums in ver. 22, 28, 34, are to be deducted, as being themſelves firſt-born, and, in that quality, already conſecrated to God, and conſequently could not ſtand as a redemption-price for others. This is the ſolution of Hezel, Schulz, and Roſenmüller, and, in fact, the ſame with that of the rabbins and De Lyra; conſequently, liable to the ſame objections: for, in the firſt place, how is it known that thoſe 300 Levites were firſt-born; or that, if firſt-born, they were not by Moſes accounted in the ſum-total of the Levites*?

But, in this hypotheſis, another knot is yet to be untied, which Roſenmüller himſelf confeſſes to be a puzzling one: *fatendum eſt difficultatem hanc eſſe momenti haud exigui, ſed tentari ſaltem debet illius explicatio.*—Well, let us ſee how the attempt will ſucceed. The difficulty lies in Bonfrerius's objection, already mentioned: Is it credible, that, among the Levites, there were only 300 firſt-born, when in each of the other tribes, at an average, there muſt have been 1,855?—Even this number of firſt-born, of a people who are ſaid, in another place, to have above 600,000 men fit for war, is very few. "Incredibilis primogenitorum "paucitas in populo qui habebat 603,555 ætatis militaris, quibus adhuc addendi maſculi inter "primum expletum menſem et viceſimum annum, id vero eſt, pœne omnes viginti annos "nondum nati. Sed ſi etiam de hoc numero remittamus, et, pro binis adultis in cenſum relatis, "ſumamus ſingulos modo fuiſſe natu minores, quam ut numerari deberent, tamen erunt ex 42 "Iſraelitis ſinguli tantum primogeniti, quod primâ fronte incredibile."—Such is the ſtatement of Roſenmüller himſelf with reſpect to the paucity, in general, of the firſt-born of the Iſraelites. "But the difficulty," ſays he, "is at leaſt diminiſhed, if not entirely done away, by conſi- "dering, 1ſt, that in the computation are not to be included thoſe who, although firſt-born, "were already married, and had families of their own: 2dly, that, in all ſuch families where a "female was the firſt-born, there could be no firſt-born male: 3dly, that, in the moſt nume- "rous polygamiſt families, none was to be accounted a firſt-born, but the *father's* firſt male

* "Quis poterit, non docente Moſe, reſcire Levitarum primogenitos eſſe ex cenſu eximendos? Confitetur ipſe Cle- "ricus, non a quovis id potuiſſe intelligi. Ergo nihil erat, cur id Moſes attento lectori permitteret ſupplendum. Nam "nullibi docet Moſes Levitarum primogenitos Deo eſſe, præ ceteris Levitis, dicandos: et tale commentum nihili eſſe "vincit ipſe Moſes. Nimirum, poſtquam dictum eſt primogenitos filiorum Iſrael, cenſu habendo, repertos fuiſſe "22,273, addit Moſes ver. 46. eos primogenitos plures eſſe Levitis numero 273. Ex quo planum fit, id על הלוים, "*ſupra Levitas*, quod extat ver. 46. numerum Levitarum indicare ver. 39 notatum, nempe 22,000. Nam falsè diceret "Moſes ver. 46. numerum filiorum Iſrael 22,273 ſuperare numerum Levitarum, ſi Levitæ eſſent numero 22,300; vel "ſi Levitæ trecenti eſſent, quorum non eſſet habitus cenſus. Quippe *ſupereſſe*, non alium numerum, qui ſuperetur, "poteſt indicare, quam eum, qui ſupra notatus eſt, nempe numerum 22,000."—Houbigant.—I confeſs, I do not ſee what good anſwer can be given to this. That of Roſenmüller is certainly a lame one: "Sed obſervanda eſt Moſis, "ſicuti omnium Hebr. ſcriptorum, conſuetudo, ut alia ſæpius repetant ſine neceſſitate, alia autem reticeant, et lectori "ſupplenda permittant."

" offspring."—Of theſe three arguments, the ſecond only is of weight; the two others are mere aſſumptions. It is nowhere ſaid that married firſt-born were to be exempted: all the firſt-born males, without exception, are ordered to be redeemed, from the age of one month upward, without any limitation of time or ſituation in life. The laſt argument is founded on an evident miſapprehenſion: it ſuppoſes that it was the *father's firſt-born male* that was only to be numbered, whereas it is clear that it was the mother's firſt-born, כל בכור פטר רחם. See ch. 3. 2. and 8. 16; alſo Exod. 13. 2, 12, 15; and 34. 19. So that if a man had four wives, and each of theſe brought him a ſon for *her* firſt child, they muſt all be accounted firſt-born. Still, then, the ſmall number of firſt-born, even of the other tribes, is ſcarcely credible; but in regard to the Levites, in the ſuppoſition that they had only 300 firſt-born, it is hardly poſſible.

On the whole, then, I cannot but acquieſce in the opinion of thoſe interpreters who think that, in ver. 28, a letter has been dropped out of the text; and that, for שש, we ſhould read שלש.

CHAP. IV.

Ver. 1. ALTHOUGH the words *and to Aaron* ſeem to be an early interpolation, and are wanting in 10 Heb. and 1 Chald. MSS. as alſo in the printed edition of the Jeruſ. Tharg.; yet as they are in Sam. and all the verſions, I have retained them in the text, which, however, would be more analogous without them.

Ver. 3. *From the age of twenty-five years.* The preſent texts, both Heb. and Sam. have שלשים שנה, thirty years; and ſo all the verſions, ſave Sep. which, in my opinion, has alone preſerved the true reading; which is that of P. P. ch. 8. 24. as marked in my Var. Read.—By Roſenmüller and others the number *thirty* is defended, and reconciled with ch. 8. 24. in this manner. In that chapter, ſay they, it is queſtion only of ſelecting Levites for the general ſervice of the tabernacle, but here of ſelecting Levites for carrying it and its utenſils; an office which required the full vigour of age. This is taking for granted what was to be proved. —In ch. 8. 24. there is no diſtinction made in the age of the Levites who were to *attend to the ſervice of the convention-tent*, לצבא צבא בעבדת אהל מועד; and ſurely the carrying of the tabernacle and its utenſils was a part of that *ſervice*. The only diſtinction there made is of thoſe who had paſſed their fiftieth year; after which they were diſpenſed from the harder *ſervice* of the tabernacle, but ſtill miniſtered with their brethren at the convention-tent.

Ver. 32. *By name*, &c. בשמות. Hence ſome commentators imagine that every utenſil had its peculiar name, like as the two columns of Solomon's Temple, which were called *Jachin* and *Boaz*. I believe that the phraſe here means no more than that every utenſil was *named*, or *told* over, to the perſons who were to carry them; or perhaps every board, &c. had its peculiar mark, by which it could readily be replaced in its own ſituation.

CHAP.

CHAP. V.

Ver. 6. THAT the law couched in this and the following verſes is the ſame with that in Levit. 5. 20—26, only expreſſed in ſomewhat different terms, is clear from the general tenor of both, and from the penalty annexed to each. But a new caſe is here ſuppoſed, namely, that no perſon claims compenſation; in which caſe it goes to the prieſt.

Ver. 16. *This the prieſt ſhall preſent*, &c. In our public verſion the relative pronoun אתה is referred to the woman: "And the prieſt ſhall bring HER near," &c. But אתה muſt be referred not to the *woman*, but to her *donative* *. The ant. verſions are, indeed, generally ambiguous, becauſe the words that expreſs *donative* and *woman* are both of the ſame feminine gender. Thus the αυτην of Sep. may have for its antecedent either γυνη or θυσια; yet the *eam* of Vulg. † can hardly be referred to any other word than *oblatio:* and the Douay tranſlators have accordingly well rendered, *offer it*.—The Greek of Venice makes a curious diſtinction between the אתה of the firſt comma and the affix ה of the ſecond comma: the former it refers to the *donative*, the latter to the *woman:* Προσουσει τουνυ αυτα ὁ ἱερευς, ϛησει τ' αυτην ενωπιον τυ ουτωτυ: and I am not ſure but that this is a juſt diſtinction. But, on the whole, I am rather inclined to think, that both the pronouns relate to the ſame thing, that is, to the *donative*; and have, with Jerom, followed that idea in my verſion, taking the affix of העמדה to be the ſame with the preceding אתה.

Ver. 17. In the preface to my firſt Volume of the Bible, I have ſaid, that this law "appears to "be rather an ingenious *terriculum* than a practical part of permanent juriſprudence." I here give Secker's note on the paſſage: "I remember no inſtance of this water of jealouſy either "producing the effect of the curſe, or the effect mentioned ver. 28, or indeed of its being "ever uſed. The rabbins ſay it was left off, in the latter days of the ſecond temple, by "reaſon of the multiplication of adulteries, i. e. on the man's part; for they underſtand "ver. 31 to ſay, that, if the man was guiltleſs, the water would have its bad effect on the "woman; elſe not: and it may be ſo underſtood ‡. This trial was not to be uſed but when "the truth could not be otherwiſe known. Had it been appointed without divine authority, "it would never hurt any, unleſs conſciouſneſs produced the effect, or unleſs ſomething "more than is here appointed was mixed with the water §. But as the latter of theſe things "is, at leaſt, poſſible—and as, when the water did no hurt, it could ſcarce ever be proved "that the woman had been guilty and the huſband not guilty—and as we know not whether "this trial was often or ever made—the proof which ſome draw from it from the divine ori-

* "Quidam intelligunt *mulierem:* ſed malè: verbum קרב enim ſemper adhibetur de oblatione ſacrificii, aut ferti." Roſenmüller. † Quia ſacrificium zelotypiæ eſt, et *oblatio* inveſtigans adulterium offeret igitur *eam* ſacerdos, et ſtatuet coram Domino. ‡ I think it cannot be ſo underſtood. § From a gentleman who reſided ſome conſiderable time in Sierra Leon, I have learned that a ſimilar practice prevails among the Mandengoes and Bullamites, and is conſidered as a religious rite. The water is impregnated with the bark of a tree called *Macon*. The compoſer and adminiſtrator is generally a prieſt. The effects are fatal when the perſon who drinks it happens to be *poor;* but for the *rich* the potion is not ſo powerful. When the ſubject eſcapes immediate death, ſhe is left in a debilitated ſtate, and commonly dies in leſs than a year after.

"ginal

" ginal of the Law of Moſes ſeems not very ſtrong."—So far the archbiſhop; to which I add, that this law, at leaſt, has ſo little the appearance of a divine origin, that it is unworthy of an upright human legiſlator. The injuſtice of it conſiſts in this, that there is no brand of infamy put upon the man, even when the woman, who undergoes the ordeal, is pronounced guiltleſs; no compenſation made to her for falſely and publicly defaming her. As a political device it may be in ſome meaſure defended: the Hebrews, like all the eaſtern nations, were exceſſively jealous; and, although themſelves polygamiſts, could not brook the ſmalleſt deviation from conjugal duty in their wives. Hence a little pious fraud was deemed expedient to remove their too often ill-grounded ſuſpicions, and this religious ceremony inſtituted for the purpoſe, and at the ſame time to deter wives from perjury when they were conſcious of guilt *. Thoſe who wiſh to ſee a great deal on this ſubject may conſult Michaëlis's *Moſaiſches Recht.* part v. ſect. 263.

Ver. 18. *The corroſive execration water.* מי המרים המאררים. So the Heb. text; but Sam. has מארים inſtead of מרים; and 1 Heb. MS. has המארירים for המארים. The antients vary in rendering theſe words. Sep. *το ὑδωρ του ελεγμου του επικαταρωμενου τουτου* †: but how they could render either מרים or מארים by *ελεγμου*, it is not eaſy to conceive. Houbigant thinks they may have read in their Heb. copy either חברים from ברה, or חקרים from חקר ‡. But although the verb *ελεγχω*, or its derivatives *ελεγμος*, *ελεγξις*, *ελεγχος*, occur above ninety times in the Septuagint verſion, it never expreſſes either of the Hebrew roots which Houbigant ſuppoſes them to have read here: it is generally the coactive voice of יכח which they render by *ελεγχω*, as their *ελεγμος* is the repreſentative of תוכחה. It is my belief that here they read בארים, or perhaps מבארים, both which will bear to be rendered *ελεγμος*: and I am even inclined to think that this was the original Samaritan lection, as the Samaritan verſion has בורה.—The paraphraſe of Vulg. is, *aquas amariſſimas, in quibus cum execratione maledicta congeſſit*—Onk. מי מריריא מלטטיא—Tharg. מיא מריריא בדוקיא—Syr. מיא מרירא בחרא—Both Arabs, אלמא אלמר אללאען—Perſ. אן מר אן לענת כנאן—Gr. Ven. *ὑδατος πικρα καταρατικα.* All theſe tranſlators ſeem to have read מרים, and to have conſidered it as denoting *bitter*, except Sep. and the Sam. interpreter, who had before them the ſame reading, whatever it were, and underſtood it in the ſame manner. In the ſuppoſition that this is the genuine reading, the firſt comma might be thus rendered, *the proof-water*; a meaning perfectly agreeable to the context, and a moſt proper epithet for the water in queſtion. However, as there is no veſtige of ſuch a reading in any Heb. or Sam. copy of the text yet diſcovered, I was unwilling to think that they have been all uniformly corrupted, and have tried to make a ſuitable meaning out of the text as it now ſtands; I mean in the Sam copy; for I conſider מארים as the true reading, and make it

* " Sponte quiſque intelligit, ſymbolicum hunc fuiſſe ritum, cui quidem *nulla vis* inerat, ſed qui tamen mulierem " adulterii ream a perjurio deterrere potuit." Roſenmüller. † So Vat. with Ox. Canon. and Theodoret. But Ald. Compl. Alex. Glaſg. Sar. have *το επικαταρωμενο τουτο*; and ſo ſeems Auſtin to have read in his old Ital. The Copt. ver. alſo favours this reading; and in ver. 24 even the Vat. copy has *το ὑδωρ το επικαταρωμενον*: ſo that this ſeems to be the genuine reading. ‡ Drawing his conjecture from Prov. 18. 7. where חקר is rendered *ελεγχεται*. But this ſingle inſtance is too ſlender a prop on which to found a rational conjecture, eſpecially as חקר and מר bear little or no con-reſemblance.

a part

a part of the verb מאר *, to *fret, rankle, corrode,* and accordingly have rendered "corroſive-"water."

Thoſe who follow the preſent Heb. reading make מרים a part of the verb מרר; and, with our common verſion, render "the bitter water." But what made it bitter?—It is ſo called, ſay ſome commentators, becauſe the huſband brought his wife to this trial in a *bitter* diſpoſition, *animo amaro.* Others, with more reaſon, that the water was ſo denominated from the *bitter* effects it was to produce in the guilty perſon: this they chiefly infer from ver. 24 and 27, where למרים is commonly rendered *to embitter*; or, as it is in our public verſion, "*and become* "bitter;" or, as Roſenmüller expreſſes it, *ad acerbos dolores excitandos.* Houbigant has ſtrenuouſly combated this idea; but his note is too long to be here inſerted, nor is his reaſoning altogether concluſive. But neither is the argument derived from the למרים of ver. 24 and 27 concluſive; for even there 3 Sam. MSS. have למארים. Dathe, indeed, endeavours to ſtrengthen it by obſerving, that the interchange of the epithets, that is, putting המאררים before למרים in ver. 24 and 27, evidently leads to this meaning: "Ex qua epithetorum permutatione planè "conſtare putem, hæc eſſe illius ſynonyma, ideoque de effectu eſſe intelligendum."—I grant that the effect to be produced (in the ſuppoſition that the perſon has been guilty) is here expreſſed by the word that is tranſpoſed †, whether it be למרים, or מארים, or מבארים; but I deny that any one of theſe words is a ſynonymous term with מאררים. The only queſtion is, which of the three lections is the moſt likely to be genuine; or, in other words, whether we are to call this water *bitter, corroſive,* or *convictive.* They who approve of the firſt reading muſt render *bitter*; I, who prefer the ſecond, render *corroſive*; and the Septuagint, who ſeem to have read the laſt reading, favour the *convictive,* or *proof-giving.* The learned reader will judge for himſelf, and adopt what ſeems beſt in his own judgment.

In the rendering of המאררים, the antients are all agreed; except Syr. and the Sam. tranſlator; the former has בחרא, the latter דמבארים; whence Houbigant formed his verſion: *aquam pudicitiæ exploratricem.* In this he has not been followed—the verſion of Dathe is, *aquam perniciosam imprecationum*—Michaëlis has only "das fluchwaſſer"—Hezel: "das giftige "fluchwaſſer," *the venomous execration-water.*

Ver. 27. *Her womb ſhall be inflamed, and her thigh fall down.* צבתה בטנה ונפלה ירכה—Sep. πρησθησεται την κοιλιαν, και διαπεσειται ὁ μηρος αυτης ‡—Vulg. *inflato ventre, computreſcet femur*; and ſo equivalently moſt of the other verſions—Joſephus calls it a ſort of *dropſy* §—and Michaëlis will have it to be that rare diſeaſe called *hydrops ovarii.*—I ſhould rather take it to be a *prolapſus uteri.*

* Houbigant here objects to the authority of the Sam. copy, becauſe the word is otherwiſe written without an א in ver. 23, 24, and 27—"Sic ut eorum in ſcriptura nihil ſit autoritatis, propter ejus inconſtantiam." But Houbigant had not examined the MS. copies of Sam. ſeveral of which have המארים in all thoſe places, namely, ſix in ver. 23, four in ver. 24, and three in ver. 27. † It is obſervable, that in Sep. the words are arranged in the ſame manner in all the places, except in ver. 24, and even there the Complutenſian edition follows the common arrangement.

‡ Gr. Ven. οιδησει ἡ γαστηρ αυτης, και πεσειται ὁ μηρος αυτης. § τῳ δε σκελους εκπεσοντος αυτῃ, και την κοιλιαν ὑδερου καταλαζοντος. Antiq. l. iii. c. 11. n. 6. p. 183.

CHAP.

CHAP. VI.

THERE have been, in all times and in every nation, enthuſiaſts, who have wiſhed to ſignalize themſelves by a more than ordinary devotion, rigidity of manners, and ſeverity of diſcipline, under the various denominations of Nazarites, Phariſees, Derviſes, Brahmins, Monks, and Hermits. Egypt, ſuperſtitious Egypt, was, moſt probably, the cradle of this ſuperſtition *. Hence it gradually ſpread over all the eaſtern, and a great part of the weſtern, world. Moſes ſeems to talk of it as an already eſtabliſhed inſtitution; and the manner in which he introduces the ſubject appears to me (as it did to Leſs †) an argument that he did not much approve of it, ſince the rules which he preſcribes for the Nazarite are more calculated to deter than to allure.—The word יפלא, in ver. 2, is in our common verſion rendered *ſhall ſeparate*; not improperly corrected by Delgado into *ſhall act marvellouſly*. I have preferred the verſion of Leſs: *Si quis conſpicuum ſe reddere cupiat*, "If any one will diſtinguiſh himſelf."—So, elegantly, Sep.: ὁς αν (or εαν) μεγαλως ευξηται ευχην.

Ver. 3. *Vinegar*. חמץ. The word denotes *fermentation* of any kind; and may here mean *ſubacid* drink, whether from wine, or fruits, or herbs.

Ib. *Nor any thing that is expreſſed from grapes*. כל משרת ענבים—Sep. ὁσα κατεργαζεται εκ σταφυλης—Vulg. *quidquid de uva exprimitur*; and ſo equivalently Onk. Tharg. Bab. and Perſ.: but the other verſions have words that denote *maceration* rather than *expreſſion*. Even Gr. Ven. has βρεγμα: and, indeed, the radical meaning of the Hebrew word ſeems to point that way. "Les Arabes," ſays Laroque, "ont une boiſſon compoſée d'abricots, de raiſins, "et d'autres fruits ſecs, qu'ils mettent infuſer dans l'eau, dès le jour précédent."—May not the משרת of Moſes have been ſome ſuch liquor?—The Septuagint word κατεργαζεται will admit this meaning, which is followed by Dathe: *quidquid ex uvis paratur*—Michaëlis: "nichts vom ſaft der weintrauben."

Ver. 4. *From the ſtones to the rind*. מחרצנים ועד זג—Sep. απο στεμφυλων εως γιγαρτου—Vulg. *ab uva paſſa uſque ad acinum*—Onk. מפרצנין ועד עצורין; and ſo equivalently, but in an inverted order, the Thargums, Syr. and Saad.: but the Erpenian Arab. Perſ. and Gr. Ven. ſeem beſt to have underſtood the text. Their verſions are: מן נוי ותתי אלקשר—אז דאנה ותא בוסת—απο γιγαρτων και μεχρις ἐλυτρου. Theſe I have followed in my verſion. פרצנים denotes the minute parts, *granulos*, of the grape—זג its *rind*, or *huſk*, from its *pellucidity*. See the root זגג, through the various dialects.—Houbigant's verſion is, *nec acinos nec ipſa vinacea*—Dathe's: *ne acinos quidem aut folliculos*—Michaëlis's: "ja nicht einmahl den kern "oder die ſchaale."

Ver. 7. *The badge of his God*. נזר אלהיו. Sep. ευχη Θεου αυτου—Vulg. *conſecratio Dei ſui*—Onk. Tharg. Syr. Sam. ver. Perſ. and Erp. have words that denote a *crown*, *corona*—Saadias: נסך, *abſtinentia*—Gr. Ven. αφορισμα; which, perhaps, is of all the moſt proper rendering. It appears to mean *the long hair* of the Nazarite, which was a badge of his being *conſecrated* to God. Hence Dathe thus renders the comma: *quoniam in capite geſtat cæſariem*

* See Porphyry *De abſtinentia*, l. iv. c. 7. † In his *Programma paſchale*, 1789, of which Michaëlis has given a neat abridgment in his *Oriental Library*, of the New Series, part vi. p. 235, &c.

Deo

Deo devotam. Houbigant: *quoniam in capite gestat Dei sui insignia.* Michaëlis paraphrases thus: weil er die Gotte durch sein gelübde geheiligten haare trägt."—If one wished to retain the very etymon of the Heb. term, he might render it by *Nazireate*, or *Nazarite-mark.*—For the rest, it was a common practice among almost all the nations of antiquity to let their hair grow long in honour of some divinity; which, after a certain time, being shorn, was burned as a sort of sacrifice; as the hair of the Nazarite is ordered to be offered here in ver. 18. See Spencer *De Leg. Heb.* lib. iii. dissert. 1. c. 6.

Ver. 9. There is, in the Latin Vulgate, a grievous mistake in the rendering of a part of this verse. It makes the head of the Nazarite to be twice shaved: *quod radet illico die purgationis suæ, et rursum die septimâ.*

CHAP. VII.

ON this chapter I have little to add to what has been said in Explanatory Notes. In ver. 3 interpreters are not agreed about the precise meaning of עגלות צב. By Sep. they are rendered ἁμαξας λαμπηνικας; but by Aquila κατασκεπαςας, followed by Jerom, *plaustra tecta*, and by most modern translators: not without reason; for צב, in Arabic, certainly signifies to *enclose*, *shut in.* Those waggons, then, were *close-covered* carts, perhaps somewhat like our provision-carts. There are critics, however, who think that צבא, not צב, was the original reading; and this conjecture is favoured by the Sam. version, which has עגלן חיל, *military waggons*; and by the Greek scholiast, who says that the Sam. copy had ἁμαξας δυναμεως. Nay, Symmachus has also ὑπουργιους. All which induced Houbigant to render *plaustra ministerii*, service-waggons: a very plausible version; yet it is odd that not one MS. either Heb. or Sam. has now the lection צבא. I have therefore chosen to keep by the old version, with Dathe, Michaëlis, Hezel, &c.

Ver. 10. *Their handsel-offerings.* את חנכת. Sep. τον εγκαινισμον; a most proper term, which in Latin might be called *initiale.* But I believe there is no term in any language that corresponds better with the Heb. than our *handsel.* The "einweihungsopfer" of Michaëlis is likewise a very proper translation. We might say *initial-offering.*

Ver. 18. From this verse to verse 83 the text is much shortened in the Arabic version of Saadias, by the omission of all the verses which contain only a repetition of the things offered by the chiefs of the tribes, which are precisely the same. Dathe, in his Latin version, has followed the same method, with the following note: "Munera duodecim principum eadem "fuerunt, et in textu Hebræo iisdem verbis describuntur. Ego vero nolui eadem toties repe-"tere, neque vereor ne propterea reprehendar."—It would not, I fear, have so fared with me. If I had omitted those *repetitions*, howsoever useless, I should have incurred certain blame. But German liberality of sentiment is, yet, almost a stranger to England.

CHAP. VIII.

Ver. 7. *LET them ſhave their whole body.* So did the Egyptian prieſts, according to the teſtimony of Herodotus: Ὁι δε ἱερεις ξυρευνται παν το σωμα, δια τριτης ἡμερας, ἱνα μητε φθειρ, μητε αλλον μυσαρον μηδεν, εγινεται σφι θεραπευουσι τους Θεους. Euterp. c. 37.

Ver. 9. *The whole aſſembly*, &c. In this and all ſuch places, by the whole aſſembly, כל עדת, we are generally to underſtand the delegates or repreſentatives of the people; their patriarchal chiefs, the ſanhedrim.

CHAP. IX.

Ver. 1. *IN the firſt month of the ſecond year.* This is an hiſtorical regreſſion to a prior period; a thing not uncommon in the writer of the Pentateuch. What is here related muſt have happened before the muſter mentioned in ch. 1.

CHAP. X.

Ver. 5. *AN alarm.* תרועה; from ריע, Arab. ريع; *to break.* Hence Jerom has well rendered, *prolixior atque conciſus* *. The Septuagint have σημασιων: better the Greek of Venice, αλαλαγμον. Not badly Saad. נפוחה מגלבה. It is the Latin *taratantara*; which is little more than an imitation, or prolongation, of the Heb. word.

Ver. 9. *If when ye go to war . . . . . ye blow an alarm with theſe trumpets*, &c. The ſound of the trumpet has ever been conſidered as proper to excite courage in combatants.

Ære ciere viros, Martemque accendere cantu.

Ver. 29. *Hobab, the ſon of Reuel.* It is the remark of Archbiſhop Secker that our common tranſlation here varies, having here *Raguel*, but in Exod. *Reuel.* This ſeems to me a ſort of proof that Exodus and Numbers were tranſlated by different perſons. The tranſlator of Numbers followed the Greek and Vulg.; that of Exodus the Maſoretic punctuation. It is of little moment; only uniformity would be better. I cannot but here obſerve, that Moſes's earneſt requeſt to Hobab to accompany the Iſraelites, on account of his *knowing how they ſhould encamp in the wilderneſs*, and *be to* them *inſtead of eyes*, appears to be ſtrange, if we are literally to believe what is related of the cloud in ch. 9. 17—23; and again in this ſame chap. 10, 11, 33, 34. If the cloud continually guided and directed their marches and encampments, what need was there of an Hobab to be *inſtead of eyes to them?* To me it appears, from this very paſſage, that Moſes was conſcious that Hobab knew the wilderneſs, and the

* So Virgil:—Martius ille æris rauci canor increpat, et vox
Auditur *fractos* ſonitus imitata tubarum. Georg. iv. 71, 72.

places

places in it proper for encampments, better than himſelf or his cloud either *.—For the reſt, a good guide was exceedingly neceſſary, and ſtill is neceſſary, in traverſing thoſe deſerts, particularly one who is well acquainted with the water-ſprings and the beſt paſtures. Hobab, being a Midianite, and moſt probably a *Nomade* or *Beduine*, was a very proper perſon to be the conductor of the Iſraelites; "Hæc igitur loca, optimumque ac cuivis regione aptiſſimum "caſtrametendi modum Chobabus oſtendere, atque ita varia ac multiplici ratione Iſraelitis "proſpicere ac conſulere poterat. Licet enim Iſraelitæ *nube duce* uteretur, hæc tamen dun- "taxat tractum ſitumque regionis, ad quam vel proficiſcendum vel ſubſiſtendum erat, monſtra- "bat; *multa* vero ſimul *humanæ prudentiæ* relicta erant." Thus, cautiouſly and prudently, Roſenmüller!

Ver. 36. *Give repoſe, O Lord! to the myriads of Iſrael.* שובה' יהוה' רבבות אלפי ישראל. The word שובה has, after Jerom, been generally rendered *return to*; the prepoſition אל, *to*, being underſtood before רבבות. But it is juſtly remarked by Houbigant that this is an awkward verſion; for, granting that an אל or על might be underſtood, which ought not readily to be granted, "non locum habere poteſt *revertere*, de Arca dictum [jam] requieſcente, nec "ab Iſrael nunquam diſcedente. Nos igitur, *converte, Domine, millia millium Iſrael.*" This verſion is evidently favoured by Sep.: επιστρεφε, Κυριε, χιλιαδας μυριαδας εν τῳ Ισραηλ.—I conſider שוב here as an active verb, in its third ſignification, correſponding with the Latin *quieſco*, in its active ſignification, and render *give repoſe to, fac-quieſcere.*

CHAP. XI.

Ver. 1. *WHICH conſumed a part of the camp.* ותאכל בקצה המחנה. In our common verſion theſe words are rendered, "and conſumed *them that were* in the outermoſt parts of the "camp:" on which Secker has the following juſt remark: "Sep. *conſumed part of the* "*camp* †;" rightly, for אכל is elſewhere followed by a ב; and קצה doth not always ſignify an "*extremity*, but *any part*, or *every part* ‡. Dele, therefore, *them that were in.*"—To this I ſhall only add, that the Latin tranſlator of the Sam. text has very properly rendered *et conſumpſit partem caſtrorum.* Houbigant: *partem caſtrorum abſumpſit.* I ſubjoin the ſenſible note of Roſenmüller: "Verbum קצה hic notat *partem*, ut infra cap. 22. 41. et 23. 13. Coll. Arab. "קצי *tractus, plaga.* Videtur autem fulmen dumeta et fruticeta, in illis deſertis frequentia, "incendiſſe; qui ignis non facilè extinguendus, et cito huc illuc currens brevi multa tentoria "conſumere potuit, ſi enim fulmen aliquot duntaxat tentoria incendiſſet, vicina ab iis cele- "riter amoveri, et ita flammâ eripi, potuiſſent."

Ver. 4. *Yet again.* I am here of the opinion of thoſe interpreters who conſider ישבו ויבכו as a pure Hebraiſm denoting *repetition.* The Septuagint, however, took ישבו in another ſenſe: Καθισαντες εκλαιον: and ſo Vulg. *ſedens et flens*; which Houbigant follows, and defends againſt Le Clerc with his uſual acuteneſs. But Dathe, elegantly, *denuo flere incipiebant*—Michaëlis: "fingen auch wieder an zu klagen."

* See Toland's *Hodegus*, and a ſtrange *anſwer* to it in Bibliotheca Biblica, vol. ii. p. 166. † Και κατεφαγε μερος τι της παρεμβολης. ‡ To the inſtances marked by the Archbiſhop, namely, Jerem. 51. 31. and Ezek. 33. 2. add Job, 21. 25. and Zachar. 11. 1. and 12. 6.

Ib. *Oh! that we had fleſh to eat!* But how could they want fleſh to eat, when they are ſaid, in Exod. 12. 38. to have had *flocks and herds in great abundance?*—To ſolve this difficulty, ſome imagine that they were forbidden to kill their cattle, during their journey in the deſert, except ſuch as were to be ſacrificed, grounding this opinion on what is ſaid Levit. 17. 1—7; but I confeſs I ſee nothing in that paſſage that ſupports ſuch an idea: it is there only forbidden to "ſlaughter, either in the camp or out of the camp, an ox, or a ſheep, or a goat, "as an *holocauſt*, or *euchariſtic ſacrifice*;" but there is no prohibition to kill them for common eating. Indeed, if there had been no other cattle ſlaughtered but ſuch as were ſacrificed at the convention-tent, their flocks and herds muſt have increaſed enormouſly; and many of them died a natural death in the courſe of forty years. I am inclined to think, then, that the word בשר, here rendered *fleſh*, denotes only the *fleſh* of *fiſh*, as it certainly does in Levit. 11. 11. And indeed the next verſe ſeems to ſupport this explication: "We remember "how freely we ate *fiſh*." It was, then, particularly, the *fleſh* of *fiſh* for which they longed, which was greatly more reliſhing than either the *beef* or *mutton* of thoſe regions; which, unleſs when young, is dry and unpalatable. Of the great abundance and deliciouſneſs of the fiſh of Egypt, all authors, antient and modern, are agreed. The curious reader may conſult, on that ſubject, Herodotus Euterp. c. 93. Diodor. Siculus, lib. 1. Strabo, l. 18. Athenæus, lib. vi. Sicard *Memoires des Miſſions*, tom. vi. p. 233. Pococke, part i. p. 300. and other later travellers. The lake of *Tenis*, or *Menzale*, which bordered on the land of Goſhen, is at this day particularly abundant in fiſhes of various kinds. Bakoui ſays that they reckoned *ſeventy* ſorts of fiſhes in it. Notices des MSS. du Roi, vol. ii. p. 432.

Ver. 5. *Cucumbers.* קשאים. This is moſt probably the *cucumis chate*, or *queen of cucumbers*. "It grows," ſays Haſſelquiſt, p. 258, "in the fertile earth round Cairo, after the "inundation of the Nile, and not in any other place in Egypt, nor in any other ſoil. It "ripens with water-melons: its fleſh is almoſt of the ſame ſubſtance, but is not nearly ſo cool. "The grandees eat it as the moſt pleaſant fruit they find, and that from which they have leaſt "to apprehend. It is the moſt excellent of this tribe of any yet known."

Ib. *Melons.* אבטחים. There is little doubt of this being the water-melon, as in Arabic it ſtill retains the Heb. name בטיח, *batech*. Haſſelquiſt thus deſcribes it, p. 355: "It is "cultivated on the banks of the Nile, in the rich clayey earth, which ſubſides during the "inundation, from the beginning of May until the overflowing of the Nile, i. e. to the "end of July or beginning of Auguſt; and in the iſland Delta, eſpecially at Burlos, whence "the largeſt and beſt are brought. This ſerves the Egyptians for *meat*, *drink*, and *phyſic*. "The fleſh of it is eaten with bread: the juice is collected in a hole made in the melon, "and is a moſt refreſhing, but ſometimes dangerous, drink: and the ſame juice, mixed with "roſe-water and a little ſugar, is the only medicine uſed by the common people in burning "fevers. This is very comfortable to the patient; for it cools and refreſhes him."

Ib. *Leeks.* חציר. There is little or no doubt of this being the *leek*. See Celſius, part ii. p. 263. There is as little doubt of the next two words, בצלים and שומים, being *onions* and *garlic*.

Ver. 7. *Its colour was that of a pearl.* I have endeavoured to prove, in my Rem. on Gen. 2. 12. that בדלח ſignifies not the exſudation called *bdellium*, but *the pearl*.

Ver. 8.

Ver. 8. *Its taſte was like that of an oiled cake.* The preſent Heb. text has כטעם לשד השמן, which in our public verſion is rendered "as the taſte of freſh oil *." I expected to find ſome variety of lection in the Sam. copy, or in ſome Sam. or Heb. MS.; but, No. Yet the antient interpreters ſeem to have had before them a different reading; for thus they render: Sep. ὡσει γευμα εγκρις εξ ελαιου—Aq. του μαζου ελαιου †—Vulg. *ſaporis quaſi panis oleati*—Onk. כטעם דליש במשחא—Tharg. Bab. כטעם ביזא די מסבלא בשומנא—Tharg. Jeruſ. כטעם בששין בדבש—Syr. איך טעמא דליש במשחא—Sam. ver. כטעם לשוד משוחה—Saad. טעמה ראלוה׳ ברסם Erp. מתל טעמה אלאסקנגה׳ באלעסל—Perſ. ונון מזוד בבסתני רועני—Gr. Ven. ὡς γευσις λεπους του ελαιου.—It is evident that none of theſe verſions (except the Samaritan) accord with the preſent textual reading. The word לשד occurs but twice in the Bible; here, and in Pſ. 32. 4. where in our common tranſlation it is rendered *moiſture*. Nor derive we any aid from the ſiſter dialects, unleſs perhaps from the Arabic, of which preſently.

It is a wonder that Houbigant did not here exert his conjectural abilities. He contents himſelf with the preſent reading, and renders thus: *quarum ſapor ſimilis erat ſapori ſpiritûs oleo expreſſi*. But what is a *ſpirit* expreſſed from oil?—This is not more intelligible than the *viror* of Montanus.

It has been ſuppoſed that Sep. Syr. Onk. and Jerom, read in their copies, not לשד, but לש, from the root לוש; and this ſuppoſition has a great degree of probability. Aquila, the Bab. Thargumiſt, and the Perſic tranſlator, ſeem to have read שד, or conſidered the ל as a mere prefix. But the Sam. tranſlator certainly read as we do at preſent, as he retains the Heb. word. What then ſhall we ſay? that this reading is a corruption? or that לשד has a different meaning from that aſſigned to it in our lexicons?—Michaëlis ſuſpected that the letters which compoſe the three Heb. words were originally theſe: לשדהשמנרבש, and ſhould be thus divided: לש דהש מן דבש: which he renders *placenta mollis ex melle confecta*. The grounds of this conjecture are, 1ſt, becauſe, in Exod. 16. 31. the manna is ſaid to have a taſte ſimilar to that of *honeyed wafers*: 2d. becauſe, here, the Jeruſ. Tharg. and Arab. Erp. ſeem to have read רבש inſtead of שמן. Roſenmüller thinks the preſent reading may be defended: "Tamen mihi lectio Maſorethica ſenſum non ineptum dare videtur, ſi לשד interpreta-"mur bucellas, *parvas placentas*; cujus ſignificationis veſtigium adhuc in Arab. deprehen-"dere mihi videor: לוד enim ſignificat *congeſta offa* . . . Igitur erunt לשד השמן, *buccellæ in* "*oleo maceratæ*."—However this be, I thought it beſt to follow the more antient verſions, and have, with Luther ‡, rendered *oiled cakes*.

Ver. 15. *That I may not ſee my miſery.* Two of Kennicott's MSS. inſtead of *my miſery*, רעתי, read רעתם, *their miſery*: and the Jeruſalem Tharg. has alſo the ſame reading, ולא אחמי בבישתהון; and adds, by way of explanation, דעמך, *who are thine own people*. Nay, Jarhi aſſures us that this is the right reading. "Scribendum ei fuiſſet ברעתם; ſed utitur ſcriptura "cognominatione: atque hæc una eſt ex correctionibus ſcribarum in lege, ad cognomentum "et correctionem linguæ." The Maſora tells us that there are eighteen ſuch places. See Buxtorf's *Lex. Talmud.* p. 1054. or Eichhorn's *Einleitung*, vol. i. ſect. 116.

* By Montanus, *ſicut ſapor viroris olei.* † What was the verſion of Sym. is uncertain, as Scharfenberg has ſhown in his excellent *Animadverſions*, p. 107. ‡ "Und es hatte einen geſchmack wie ein oelkuche."—So alſo Dathe—"*Sapore ſimilis erat pani oleato*—and his precurſor in elegance, Caſtalio—*ſapore libi oleo confecti.*

Ver. 16.

Ver. 16. In my Explan. Note I have ſaid that the ſeventy elders here mentioned were, probably, the ſame with thoſe mentioned in Exod. 24. 1. But I cannot think, with ſome commentators, that they were the ſame with the judges and officers appointed in Exod. 18. 24. Le Clerc has almoſt demonſtrated the contrary. See his *Diſſertatio de Synedrio*, at the end of his Comment. on the Hiſtorical Books of the O. T. See alſo Michaëlis's *Moſaiſches Recht.* tom i. ſect. 50.

Ver. 25. To what I have ſaid in my Explan. Note, I cannot perhaps do better than abridge the *ſcholium* of Roſenmüller: "Cum dicitur *Jehovam ſe poſuiſſe nonnihil ex ſpiritu Moſes, et* "*impertire id ſeptuaginta ille ſenibus*, ſine dubio nihil aliud ſignificatur, quam hoc: ſingulari "Dei providentia factum eſſe, ut 70 illi viri, Moſis adhortatione permoti, ſubito animum "ſeditioſum mutaſſent, ad Moſem tranſiiſſent, eumque adjuvaſſent. . . . Subita illa animi mu- "tatio, in lingua antiqua et egena, ab hominibus exculta qui nihil fere niſi corporea cogitare "ſolent, non facilè aliter exprimi potuiſſe videtur, quam per metaphoricam locutionem quæ "hoc loco legitur וידו כנוח עליהם הרוח ad verbum *Et factum eſt, cum quieviſſet ſuper hos hic* "*ſpiritus*, i. e. *tali animo adfecti*. . . . . Plerique interpretes יתנבאו vertunt *et vaticinati ſunt.* "At in tota hac hiſtoria nihil de prædictione rerum futurarum occurrit . . . igitur illa interpre- "tatio contextui plane non eſt apta *. . . . . Hoc loco, ubi ſermo eſt de ſubita animi mutatione "in 70 ſenibus, verbum והתנבא indicare videtur, viros illos præter omnem expectationem "ſeditionis ſedandæ cauſa populum hortatos eſſe, ut officii erga Deum et Moſem memor eſſet: "quæ interpretatio præcipuè confirmatur per id quod ver. 29. legitur; ubi Moſes, cum "Joſhua ei nuntias, eos etiam viros, ex 70 ſenibus, qui in caſtris remanſiſſent, προφητευειν, in "hæc verba erumpit: *Num mea cauſa invides? Utinam totus populus ita loqueretur ut viri* "*illi*: ex quibus verbis ſatis clare intelligi poteſt, viros illos populum ſeditioſum ad meliora "hortatos eſſe."

Ver. 26. I have disjoined from ver. 25 two words which are different in the Heb. and Sam. copies. In the former they are written thus: ולא יספו: and commonly rendered either "and "did not ceaſe †," [to propheſy,] as in our public verſion, or "and did not add ‡," as they are rendered by Ainſworth and Purver; neither of which renderings is to me intelligible.—The reading of Sam. is ולא יאספו, which in the Latin verſion Pol. is badly rendered *et: ſed non ultra addiderunt* §, although the Sam. verſ. ולא אכנסו pointed out the true tranſlation, *Et non congregati ſunt.* By adopting this reading, with Houbigant, Dathe, and Roſenmüller, and placing ולא יאספו at the head of ver. 26, the text will be rectified, and the ſenſe clear: *At non congregati ſunt, ſed remanſerant in caſtris viri duo, quorum nomen unius Eldad et nomen alterius Medad, tamen requievit ſuper eos ſpiritus ille (nam ipſi ex conſcriptis, etſi non egreſſi erant ad tentorium) et prophetabant in caſtris.*—The words in parentheſis I have in my verſion removed from their place, to make the meaning ſtill clearer, and the phraſing more agreeable to the Engliſh idiom.

Ver. 31. *At the height of about two cubits above the ground.* כאמתים על פני הארץ; com-

* I have, however, retained the word *propheſy* in my verſion; becauſe it has in our language obtained a meaning of greater latitude than the Latin *vaticinor*. † With Vulg. *nec ultra ceſſaverunt.* ‡ So Sep. και ουκ επι προσθεντο. The former conſidered סוף as the *radix*; the latter, יסף. § In the idea, probably, that the א in יאספו was an interpolation; but it is more probable that an א has been dropped out of the Heb. copies.

monly

monly rendered, as in our public verſion: "as it were two cubits *high* upon the face of the "earth." A wonderful fall of locuſts this! But how could the people gather them? The Thargums tell us that "they waded through them up to the navel, and yet were not fatigued!" But the Hebrew words import no ſuch abſurd meaning; and are well rendered by Jerom: *volabantque in aere, duobus cubitis altitudine ſuper terram.* They flew ſo nigh the ground, that they were eaſily caught*: which is ſtill the caſe, when quails after a long aërial voyage are exhauſted with fatigue. The device of Roſenmüller and ſome others to ſave the common rendering is this: "Puto potius verbis Hebræis indicari, bicubitales acervos hinc illinc fuiſſe "diſperſos, ut vacua ſubinde ſpatia remanſerint, per quæ populus collecturus ire potuerit."—— This certainly ſaves them from *wading up to the navel:* but I fear it would not have ſaved them from the plague. The putrefaction of *bicubital* heaps of quails, *to the diſtance of a day's journey round the camp*, would certainly have been no pleaſant neighbourhood.

Ver. 32. *Spread them out to dry.* וישטחו שטוח. But the Sam. copy has וישחטו שחוטה; or, as 4 MSS. וישחטו שחוט, *mactaverunt mactatione.* The tranſpoſition of a letter makes all the difference; and this has not unfrequently happened, in tranſcribing the text. Even here one of Kennicott's MSS. had at firſt וישחטו. All the antient verſions, however, are againſt the Samaritan lection.

Ver. 33. *The Lord ſmote the people with a great mortality.* ויך יהוה בעם מכה רבה מאד. "Hac locutione (ſays Roſenmüller) ſæpe alias *repetita mors multorum hominum* indicatur; "veluti ſupra verſ. 1. hujus capitis. Hinc totus hic verſus nil aliud continebit quam hoc: Inter "ipſam coturnicum epulationem multos homines eſſe ſublatos; id quod priſci homines pœnam "murmurationis contra Deum exiſtimârunt. Cauſa vero ſubitæ illius mortis, ſine dubio, natu- "ralis erat: ſcilicet, jam veteres obſervârunt coturnices elleboro et aliis herbis venenatis veſci "ſolere; qua de re multa collegit Bochartus†. Talibus coturnicibus qui veſcebantur Iſraelitæ "eſu carnium harum inſalubrium perierunt."

The ſum of the ſtory ſeems to be, That the people had become ſeditious and clamorous for food. Moſes, to appeaſe them, ſelects ſeventy of their chiefs, and reaſons with them upon the pernicious tendency of ſuch a conduct: theſe ſeize his own ſpirit, and propheſy; that is, controul by their perſuaſive enthuſiaſm the propenſity of the riotous multitude. Meanwhile a flight of quails comes opportunely to gratify their deſires: theſe they eat voraciouſly, and fall victims to their own intemperance. All the reſt is, in my conception, oriental imagery and poetical exaggeration.

Ver. 34. *Kibroth-aathava.* Niebuhr ſeems to think that this may be the preſent *Gabel-el-mokateb*; where he found ſepulchral inſcriptions, in Egyptian hieroglyphics, of exquiſite beauty. If there could be any proof adduced, that thoſe inſcriptions were the work of the Iſraelites, it would lead to many curious concluſions; among others, that Moſes may have written his Laws in Egyptian characters, which were afterwards tranſpoſed into Syrian letters.

* Joſephus underſtood the text in the ſame manner. His words are: Και, μετ' ολιγον, ορτυγων πληθος (τρεφει δε τουτο το ορνεον, ως ουδεν ετερον, ο Αραβικος κολπος) εφιπταται την μεταξυ θαλασσαν υπερελθον, και υπο κοπου τε αμα της πτησεως, και προσγαιον μαλλον των αλλων ον, καταφερεται εις τους Εβραιους· Οι δε συλλαμβανοντες, ως τροφην αυτοις του Θεου ταυτην μηχανησαμενου, την ενδειαν ιωντο. Antiq. l. i. c. 1. n. 5. p. 120.

† Hieroz. pars ii. p. 97.

CHAP.

CHAP. XII.

Ver. 1. *ON account of his marrying a Chuſhite woman.* This woman is generally ſuppoſed to be Ziphora: but Ziphora was not a Chuſhite; ſhe was a Midianite. Who then was the Chuſhite woman, on whoſe account "Mary and Aaron ſpoke againſt Moſes?"—Some think it was *Tharbis*, the daughter of the king of *Chuſh*, or Æthiopia, whom Moſes is ſaid to have married before his flight from Egypt. See the note on Exod. 2. 11. p. 162. But, if ever ſuch a marriage took place, Tharbis muſt have died, or been abandoned by Moſes, long before this period. Onkelos and the other Thargumiſts give a very different turn to the paſſage. According to them, Mary and Aaron reproached Moſes, not for *marrying* a Chuſhite woman, but for *repudiating* his beautiful wife, Ziphora; who is here called a *Chuſhite*, *per antiphraſin*, from her being the very contraſt of a Chuſhite; as, in Latin, *lucus a non lucendo!*——But whence infer they that ſhe was beautiful, nay, the very pink of beauty, if we believe the Jeruſalem Thargum? Why, whence but from the ſame word *Chuſhite*, כושית, the letters of which make up the number 736? and ſo exactly do the letters of the יפה מראה, *beautiful to behold!* Reader! I give thee this as a curious ſample of Rabbinical commentatorſhip: if thou be not ſatisfied, I cannot help it*.——But, ſtill, who was the *Chuſhite* woman whom Moſes had married, and for which marriage he was reproached by his own ſiſter and his own brother?—Bochart has laboured to prove that the *Chuſhites* and *Midianites* were the ſame people; and conſequently that Ziphora may here be deſignated. But his arguments are certainly not concluſive; and his hypotheſis is barely probable: not to ſay, with Roſenmüller, manifeſtly falſe. Indeed, it is highly improbable that Ziphora could here be the cauſe of reproach, after being married to Moſes above forty years. I am inclined, then, to think, with Michaëlis, that the Chuſhite woman here mentioned was a ſecond wife, whom Moſes, about this time, took to his bed, perhaps after the death of Ziphora: but this ſecond wife was not an African Chuſhite, but an Arabian Chuſhite: and therefore the word ought not to be rendered *Æthiopian*; although that be the rendering of Sep. Vulg. and Gr. Ven.—The Oriental verſions retain the Hebrew term *Chuſhite*.

Ver. 3. *Now Moſes was the mildeſt of all men*, &c. Who can believe that this was written by Moſes himſelf? It is, evidently, an interpolation, in the ſuppoſition that the reſt of the narrative was written by Moſes; but comes in naturally enough, if the writer was a different perſon; which indeed is my belief. See however Eichhorn's *Introduction to the Old Teſtament*, tome ii. ſect. 440. p. 377. of the ſecond edition †.

* To make the comment more complete, I will juſt add Jarhi's objectional query, and R. Nathan's anſwer. "But "how did Mary know, that Moſes had ſeparated himſelf from his wife?—Rabbi Nathan ſays: Mary was with Ziphora "at the time when word was brought to Moſes that Eldad and Medad were propheſying in the camp: which when "Ziphora heard, ſhe exclaimed: Wo to the wives of thoſe men! who, if they once addict themſelves to propheſy, will "ſeparate themſelves from their wives, as my huſband has ſeparated himſelf from me. Thus Mary diſcovered the "ſecret, which ſhe imparted to Aaron."——*Propheſying*, it ſeems, and the *conjugal duty* are incompatible things. A good monkiſh idea!

† I have taken no notice of Kennicott's verſion, borrowed from Schultens's *Sylloge Diſſertationum*, becauſe I deem it indefenſible. It is: "Now the man Moſes gave forth more anſwers than, or was highly "favoured with anſwers above, all the men who were upon the face of the earth." How this verſion "anſwers the "argument of Spinoſa," I cannot perceive; for it is as unlikely that Moſes would have written after this manner, as after the other. See Kennicott's *Remarks*, p. 57.

Ver.

Ver. 6, 7, 8. There is nothing obſcure in the grammatical conſtruction of theſe three verſes: but the language is highly figurative. I cannot do better than tranſcribe Roſenmüller's annotation: "Cum Deus, in toto hoc ſermone, non Dei ipſam naturam ſed ejus voluntatem ſignificet, *videre imaginem, figuram*, Jehovæ dicitur is, qui ejus voluntatem ex emblemate quodam *conjicit*; non ipſam prolatam a Deo intelligit. Omnia autem tribus iſtis verſibus dicta huc redeunt: *Moſem Deo familiariſſimum eſſe; hinc injuriam amico Dei illatam, ab eo non inultam relictam.*"

Ver. 13. *Nay, I beſeech thee.* The preſent text has אֵל נָא, *God! I beſeech thee*; and in this ſenſe אל was taken by all the antient tranſlators from Sep. to Gr. Ven. So our common verſion, and indeed almoſt all modern verſions. Yet I am of opinion, with Michaëlis, that we ſhould point אָל נָא, as in ver 11. and render as I have done. I doubt very much if אֵל נָא be a Hebraiſm: at leaſt, I recollect not any other example. If Moſes had meant to expreſs himſelf in that manner, he would have probably uſed בי אדוני or נא יהוה. Michaëlis's verſion is: "Onein! mache ſie wieder geſund."

Ver. 14. *After which, ſhe ſhall recover.* ואחר תאסף, which in our common verſion is rendered: "and after that let her be received in *again*."—More briefly Sep. και μετα ταυτα εισελευσεται. To the ſame purport Vulg. *et poſtea revocabitur.* And ſo equivalently all the ant. verſions, including Gr. Ven.—But I cannot ſee, that the verb אסף ever ſignifies *to return*: whereas it certainly ſignifies, to recover from an illneſs; and particularly from a leproſy. See 2 Kings 5. 3, 6, 7. The radical meaning of the word is, *to gather*; and, in a metaphorical ſenſe, *to recover*: as we vulgarly ſay of a recovering perſon, *he gathers up, he picks up*; and I remember to have heard the phraſe, *She is gathering up herſelf*; which correſponds exactly with the תאסף of this verſe, and the האסף, or rather האספה * of the next.

CHAP. XIII.

Ver. 1. I HAVE often wondered at the obſtinacy, with which the integrity of the Maſoretic Hebrew text, and its ſuperiority to the Sam. Exemplar, have been defended. The words which are here wanting in the former, but expreſſed in the latter, are ſaid in Deut. 1. 20. to have been actually ſpoken by Moſes to the Iſraelites on this occaſion: and their omiſſion in the Hebrew text is a manifeſt deficiency. The omiſſion, however, muſt have been an early one, and prior to the Septuagint verſion; if the Septuagint verſion have not been here remodelled according to the Hebrew: which I greatly ſuſpect.

Ver. 3. al. 4. *At the command of the Lord.* על פי יהוה. Sep. δια φωνης Κυριου—Vulg. *quod Dominus imperaverat*: and ſo equivalently all the verſions. Moſt literally Gr. Ven. επι στοματι του οντωτου.—Delgado would render, "by the Lord's permiſſion," to ſolve what he calls *a glaring contradiction* between this place and Deut. 1. 22. But, in the Sam. copy there is no contradiction: and על פי, I think, never ſignifies *by permiſſion.*

Ver. 19. al. 20. *In open or in walled cities.* The preſent Hebrew text has התמתנים אם במבצרים, which in our common verſion is rendered: "whether in tents, or in ſtrong holds:" by Montanus: *num in caſtris, an in munitionibus.* But the queſtion is not here of *camps* or

* Which is the Samaritan reading.

*tents**: but, of what ſort were the towns; whether *weak* or *ſtrong*, *open* or *walled*? I therefore, with Houbigant, preſer the Sam. reading וחמחנים או מבצרים, without the prepoſition ב, although I have, with moſt of the ant. verſions, expreſſed it in my tranſlation. Sep. and Vulg. ſeem to have read the two terms inverſely; as the former has *ει εν τειχηρεσιν η εν ατειχιστοις*: the latter, *muratæ an abſque muris*. But neither theſe nor any other of the ant. tranſlators† appear to have read מחנים, *camps*, in their copies; except Gr. Ven. which has *εν στρατοπεδοις*. See Caſtell on the root חבן, and Houbigant's excellent note on the place.

Ver. 21. *Unto Rehob*. I have ſaid in Explan. Notes, that *Rehob*, רחוב, might be rendered appellatively; and ſo it is in Tharg. עד פלטיות מעלך לאנטוכיא‡; where mark, that this Thargumiſt took *Hamath* to be the ſame with *Antioch*. But Joſephus, with more probability, makes it *Epiphania*.

Ver. 22. al. 23. *And coming to Hebron*. I have here only to remark, that there is a groſs ſoleciſm in the preſent Hebrew text; יבא for יבאו, which laſt is the Sam. lection, and was the firſt reading of one of Kennicott's and one of De Roſſi's MSS. It was alſo read by all the antient tranſlators, ſave Onkelos and Gr. Ven. and is followed by Houbigant, Kennicott, Michaëlis, Dathe, Roſenmüller, Hezel. Even our Engliſh verſions here abandon the Hebrew, and render in the plural. Lilienthal, I believe, is the only modern who has ventured to defend the ſingular reading. Singular is his manner of defending it. "It is probable (ſays he) that the "ſpies went not conjunctly, but ſeverally, to reconnoitre the different provinces. One, then, "only, Caleb, went to explore Hebron. The enallage יבא for *venit quiſque*, 'one went,' is "common."—No, never in ſuch a conſtruction as this. He ſeems to have borrowed his idea from Jarhi; but durſt not purſue the Rabbi through his whole interpretation, which is highly ridiculous §.

Ib. *The race of Anak*. ילידי הענק. I have not, with our Engliſh tranſlators, rendered, "the "children of Anak;" that the reader might not imagine that Ahiman, Sheſhai and Thalmai were the immediate ſons of Anak. The Septuagint have, as uſual, very properly rendered, *γενεαι Ενακ*, or, as Alex. Glaſg. and ſome other MSS. better, *Ενακ*, with a *kappa*.—But who was *Enak*, or *Anak*? and what ſort of *race* were his *progeny*? Onk. Syr. Tharg. both Arabs, render appellatively, *the progeny of the* GIANT‖. To this they were moved, no doubt, by the præfix ה; which is not uſually placed before proper names. The ſame reaſon induced Michaëlis to ſeek for an appellative meaning, which he finds in the Arabic ענק, *intravit latibulum*; whence עאנקא, *a mouſe-hole*. The *Anakites*, then, were people who lived in *holes*, or caves: and ילידי ענק are *the ſons of the cave*: i. e. *Troglodytes*.—But, beſides that the *Troglo-*

* This is allowed even by Jarhi; who ſays, that מחנים, according to the Thargum, is here for מצחין, which denotes *open cities without walls*. † The comma is wanting in Syr. ‡ So alſo Gr. Ven. *αχρι πλατειας, ως αφικοιντο εις Αμαθην*. The other tranſlators retain the Hebrew word: and, indeed, we find *Rehob* among the cities of the tribe of *Aſher*. Joſh. 19. 28. It was probably the northmoſt town of that tribe, and might be called *Rehob* from the lane that led thence to *Hamath*. § "*Et venit uſque ad Hebron*. Caleb ſolus eò ivit, ac ſe proſtravit ſuper "ſepulcra Patriarcharum, (orans) ne ipſe a ſociis ſuis ſeduceretur, ut eorum conſilium ſequeretur; hinc illa (Scriptura) "dicit: *atque ei dabo terram quam calcavit*." But a more ſober Jewiſh critic than Jarhi (Norzius) acknowledges that יבא is here to be taken plurally. De Roſſi *Var. Lect.* and *Appendix*. ‖ Vulg. Perſ. and Gr. Ven. retain the Hebrew name.

dytes

dytes are elſewhere called *Horites*, not *Anakites*, Michaëlis's etymon appears to me to be conſtrained. I would rather derive the word from its Hebrew root ענק; and give it the meaning of one who *binds*, that is, *ſubjects* other people by violence. If then I were to tranſlate appellatively, I ſhould be inclined to ſay *ſons of the chain*; or, to vernaculize the very Hebrew word, *ſons of the* HANK; which, in Iſlandic and Scottiſh, ſignifies *a chain, fetter, bond.* And we ſtill ſay, *to have a hank on one.* "Quaſi dicas: *ita vinculis obſtrictum aliquem habere, ut præ* "*metu ad omnia, quæ volueris, præſto ſit.*" Lee.—Or, if an Arabic etymon be ſought, would not the idea of *pride* and *pre-eminence* be preferable? For ענק is found to have all the following ſignifications: *intumuit, eminuit, prominuit*; *mons excelſus, collis monti ſupereminens*, &c. And this etymon was probably in the view of thoſe interpreters, who have rendered הענק *Gigantis*, or *Gigantum*.—It is in favour, however, of Michaëlis's hypotheſis, that there were certainly *caves*, and large caves, about Hebron, where the race of Anakites are ſaid to have reſided: and I find that Dathe, Hezel, Schulz and Roſenmüller have adopted Michaëlis's verſion; which is, "die in unterirdiſchen höhlen wohnen *."

Ver. 23. al. 24. *When they came to the vale of Eſhchol.* They ſo named the place from the *cluſter* of grapes, which they brought thence. אשכל means *a cluſter*, and the comma is ſo rendered by Sep. ἑως φαραγγος βοτρυος—and by Jerom, *ad torrentem botri* †. Moſt copies of Sep. have here the following addition: και κατεσκεψαντο αυτην: but this is wanting in Compl. and in Serravius's MS. it is marked with an *obelos*. This, however, is no proof that it was not in the original Septuagint. We ſhall be able to ſay ſomething more on the ſubject, when we have ſeen Dr. Holmes's edition.—For the reſt, the ſize of the grapes in Paleſtine and Syria is known to be enormous. Bunches have been met with, of from *ten* to *twelve* pounds weight; and *F. Ignatius à Rheinfelden*, in 1656, ſaw a cluſter of an *ell* in length. A ſingle grape is ſometimes half a *nail* long. I have ſeen them grow, in our own climate, to a very uncommon ſize.

Ver. 29. al. 30. *The Chanaanites dwell by the ſea*, &c. The ſea here mentioned is generally ſuppoſed to be the Mediterranean; and theſe Chanaanites are thought to be ſo called κατ' ἐξοχην; or, the *Chanaanites proper*. But I am more inclined to think that the *Dead ſea* is here referred to, eſpecially as "and along the Jordan" is added.—The Philiſtines, who were not of the Chanaanite race, inhabited the coaſt of the Mediterranean.

Ver. 30. al. 31. *Here* a murmur ariſing among *the people*, &c. The text is here very laconic, and perhaps defective. ויהס כלב את העם אל משה: by Montanus rendered, *Et fecit tacere Caleb populum ad Moſeh*; by our Engliſh tranſlators: "And Caleb ſtilled the people before "Moſes."—Similarly Sep. Και κατεσιωπησε Χαλεβ τον λαον προς Μωυσην.—The Thargum paraphraſes thus: *But Chaleb ſilenced the people, and made them liſten to Moſes:* and Jerom thus: *Inter hæc Caleb compeſcens murmur populi, qui oriebatur contra Moyſen*, &c. "acting the interpreter," ſays Houbigant, "being unable to act the tranſlator." But, with Houbigant's good leave, Jerom acted the genuine tranſlator, by ſupplying what is certainly underſtood, although not expreſt in the original. Nor is there any *ſoleciſm* in Jerom's verſion, as Houbigant too raſhly affirms. The antecedent to *qui* is not *murmur*, but *populi*.—Druſius and Le Clerc

* The *Zoan* mentioned in this verſe is the *Tanis*; as it is here rendered by Sep. and Vulg. It was then the capital of Egypt. † The word *torrens* is here improper, as in ſome other places in the Vulgate.

thought ſomething had been dropt out of the text, and imagined that the gigantic *ſamech* in the word יהוה was a mark of ſome deficiency. But this is a mere Buxtorfian fancy. All the antients ſeem to have read as we do at preſent: yet, when we compare this paſſage with Deut. 1. 26. we muſt allow that Jerom has well ſupplied the want: and I have accordingly imitated him; only putting my ſupplement in Italics.—So, elegantly, Dathe: "*Orto ad hæc* "*fremitu populi*, Calebus mitigare animos in Moſem ſtuduit."—Houbigant's verſion is: "Tum Caleb, preſente Moſe, ſilentium populo imperans," &c. He would read אז for אל. One of Kennicott's MSS. has על.

Ib. *Said † to them |*. The words *to them* are only in Sam. and Sep. לו, αυτῳ. The latter, moreover, adds ουχι, *nay*: which, perhaps, is but a different rendering of לו, or לוא.

CHAP. XIV.

Ver. 13, 14. THE text is here not a little perplexed and obſcure; and, perhaps, in ſome meaſure corrupted. Yet there is no important variety of lection in either the Heb. or Sam. copies. As the whole paſſage is literally rendered by our tranſlators, I ſhall firſt give it in their words: "And Moſes ſaid unto the Lord, Then the Egyptians ſhall hear *it* (for thou "broughteſt up this people in thy might from among them); and they will tell *it* to the inha- "bitants of this land: *for* they have heard that thou, Lord, *art* among this people; that "thou, Lord, art ſeen face to face; and *that* thy cloud ſtandeth over them; and *that* thou "goeſt before them, by day in a pillar of a cloud, and in a pillar of fire by night." This is, certainly, not very intelligible, nor well expreſſed: yet it is ſimilar to moſt of the ant. verſions. That of Jerom, indeed, is ſomewhat clearer: "Ut audiant Ægyptii, de quorum medio eduxiſti "populum iſtum, et habitatores terræ hujus, qui audierunt, quod tu, Domine, in populo iſto "ſis, et facie videaris ad faciem, et nubes tua protegat illos, et in columna nubis præcedas eos "per diem, et in columna ignis per noctem: quod occideris," &c.——Let us now ſee how the Septuagint have handled the matter: Και ακουσεται Αιγυπτος, ὁτι ανηγαγες τῃ ισχυι σου τον λαον τουτον εξ αυτων· αλλα και πασαντες οἱ κατοικουντες επι της γης ταυτης, ὁτι συ ει κυριος εν τῳ λαῳ τουτῳ, ὁς οφθαλμοις κατ' οφθαλμους οπταζῃ, Κυριε, και ἡ νεφαλη σου εφεςηκεν επ' αυτων, και εν ςυλῳ νεφελης συ πορευῃ προτερος αυτων την ἡμεραν, και εν ςυλῳ πυρος την νυκτα· και εκτριψεις, κ. τ. λ.—By this verſion Houbigant thinks the whole difficulty removed. Inſtead of ואמרו אל יושב, he fancies, they muſt have read in their copy ואולם כל יושב, as they render αλλα και πασαντες κατοικουντες *et vero omnes incolæ*: and agreeably to this emendation he forms his own verſion: "Audient "hoc Ægyptii, poſtquam tu tuâ virtute populum iſtum de medio eorum eduxiſti: Sed et "omnes terræ illius habitatores audiverunt," &c.—To enforce this rendering, and that reading, he remarks that כל was eaſily changed into אל; and that ואולם and ואמרו are compoſed of the ſame letters, ſave *one*: namely, that ל has been changed into ר; as might readily be done. This laſt is acknowledged; from the great ſimilarity there is between them in MSS. where the top of ל is often ſo ſhort as hardly to be perceived: but ſuch a tranſpoſition, as altogether appears in the whole word, is certainly not very common, if not unprecedented. Nor is it certain that the Septuagint followed this reading. Their αλλα και may be equivalent to the præfix *vau* only: although, indeed, they ſeem to have read כל for אל: and if I found that reading

reading in any Heb. or Samaritan MSS. I ſhould be inclined to adopt it. But, as all the MSS. and all the other ant. tranſlators muſt have read אל in their copies; I would rather try to make a meaning out of the text ſuch as it is, than to amend it by conjectural criticiſm. I think, then, that the præfix before שמעו in ver. 13. ſhould be rendered *when*, and not *then*. I would next render כי before העלית by *although*, a meaning which it frequently has; and then include in a parentheſis all the words from שמעו in ver. 14. to לילה inclusively, as I have done in my verſion. The word אמרו, *they will ſay*, in ver. 15. is a mere reſumption, common in all languages, and particularly in our own. I need not tell my learned readers, that the word כי, or אשר, is to be underſtood before שמעו in ver. 14. This is the moſt I could make of my original: yet I confeſs that the reading כל, inſtead of אל, before יושב, without the other alterations propoſed by Houbigant, has a great degree of ſpeciouſneſs; beſide the authority of Sep.

Ver. 21. *As ſure as I live, and as my glory filleth the whole earth.* חי אני וימלא כבוד יהוה את כל הארץ: by our tranſlators thus rendered: "*As* I live, all the earth ſhall be filled with "the glory of the LORD." But this, I think, cannot be the meaning of the original—although it was ſo underſtood by all the antients; ſave Saadias, who has admirably well rendered: ולכן ובקאי אלראיים ונורי אלדי ימלא נמיע אלארץ. *By my perpetual permanency, and my ſplendor which filleth the whole earth.* The laſt comma is evidently a part of the oath; and is ſo underſtood by Jarhi, and Vatable, whoſe verſion is, *Quam certum eſt me vivere, et gloriam meam implere terram**, &c.—Not badly Purver: "Yet ſurely by my living, and the whole earth being "filled with the glory of the Lord." And, more recently, Delgado: "However, as I live, "and as the whole earth is filled with the glory of the Lord."—I have no doubt of this being the meaning: and I wonder how it eſcaped the penetration of Michaëlis, Dathe, and Hezel.

Ver. 25. The firſt part of this verſe ſeems awkwardly placed; which induced the Syriac tranſlator to make it a continuation of ver. 24, as if the territory of the *Amalekites and Chananites who inhabited the valley*, were to be a part of the poſſeſſion of Chaleb. But, by comparing this comma with ver. 43, we muſt conſider it as a parentheſis, abrupt indeed and unconnected in the original, but made ſomewhat leſs ſo, I flatter myſelf, in my verſion.

Ver. 27. *How long will this perverſe people continue their murmurings againſt me?* In the original there is only עד מתי לעדה הרעה הזאת אשר המה מלינים עלי; by Montanus moſt literally rendered: *Uſquequo ad cœtum malum iſtum, qui ipſi murmurantes ſuper me?* Nor much leſs literal Sep. Εως τινος την συναγωγην την πονηραν ταυτην; οἱ αυτοι γογγυζουσιν εναντιον μου.—Vulg. *Uſquequo multitudo hæc peſſima murmurat contra me?*—So equivalently Onk. and Syr.—Others have otherwiſe filled up the *ellipſis*; as by the words *patiar, condonabo:* and Houbigant imagines that the original text was עד מתי אשא, *Quouſque ego patiar.* So our common Engliſh verſion: "How "long *ſhall I bear with* this evil congregation?" The *lamed* before עדה is ſuppoſed to favour this ſupplement.—I believe, nothing is wanting in the text, which offers an elegant ellipſis: nor is it neceſſary to ſupply אשא: nor can אשר here, in my opinion, be rightly rendered either *which* or *who*; but *that*, conſidered as a conjunction. "How long will it be cuſtomary "to this perverſe people, *that* they will murmur," &c.—The Vulgate, then, has well expreſſed

* To the ſame purport Diodati: "Ma pure *come* Io vivo e *come* tutta la terra è repiena della mia gloria." And before him Bruccioli: "Quanto è coſa certa, ch' io vivo, e che la mia gloria riempie tutta la terra, tanto è certo," &c. Both theſe tranſlations are elegant, and juſt.

the

the meaning; followed by Michaëlis: "Wie lange will dieſe böſe gemeine mit mir unzu-
"frieden ſeyn?"—And before him Luther: "Wie lange murret dieſe böſe gemeine wider
"mich?" retained by Hezel.—But Le Clerc and Dathe, *Quouſque condonabo*, &c.—Roſen-müller adopts Houbigant's tranſlation.

Ver. 31. *Your children*, &c. I have followed the Syriac tranſlator, who had before him the text as follows: וטפכם אשר אמרתם לבז יהיה ובניכם אשר לא ידעו היום טוב ורע המה יבאו אל הארץ והביאתי אתם וידעו: correſponding almoſt with the P. P. Deut. I. 39. and partly corroborated by Sep. although their text ſeems in ſome meaſure mutilated, and varies in the different copies. For the reſt, the final mark (|) of the various reading, in my verſion, is miſplaced: it ſhould be after "land|."

Ver. 34. *And ſhall experience my averſion.* וידעתם את תנואתי: by Sep. rendered και γνωσεσθε τον θυμον της οργης μου—Vulg. *et ſcietis ultionem meam*; followed by our firſt Engliſh tranſlators; but rejected in the Biſhops' Bible, and poſterior verſions; which ſubſtitute: "and ye ſhall "know my breach of promiſe*:" on which Kennicott makes the following remark: "'Tis no "wonder that ſuch an expreſſion, when ſpoken of God, ſhould be objected to by the Deiſts. "In anſwer to *Chriſtianity as old as the Creation*, Dr. Waterland has theſe excellent obſerva-"tions: '*My breach of promiſe* is a harſh tranſlation, and merely conjectural, not warranted by "the Hebrew original. Some of our elder tranſlations had a better rendering: 'Ye "ſhall feel my vengeance:' or, 'Ye ſhall know my diſpleaſure.'"—Yet, harſh† as the other common verſion ſeems to be, it has been ſpeciouſly defended. *Breach of promiſe*, it has been ſaid, here means no more than a *revocation*, or *caſſation*, of God's former covenant, which was conditional. "*Caſſatio mea* eſt caſſatio fœderis mei vobiſcum, et promiſſionum mearum, "quæ conditionales fuere." So Malvenda: and this idea pleaſed Houbigant: "videbitiſque "ut fœdus ego vobiſcum meum fregerim."—It is not, however, eaſy to perceive, how ſuch a meaning can be drawn from תנואתי.—Onk. Syr. and Tharg. underſtood it as referring not to God, but to the murmurs of the Iſraelites againſt him, and ſome moderns have adopted that meaning.—Le Clerc defends the Vulg. verſion with plauſibility: and I find that the late Biſhop Law was of the ſame opinion. His verſion is: "and ye ſhall feel my reſentment."—I rather think that the primitive meaning of נוא or נוי is ανανευειν, *abnuere*: and Gr. Ven. thus renders the comma in queſtion: εισεσθε τε την ανανευσιν μου.

Ver. 37. *Were ſtruck* dead, *before the Lord.* "Videntur ſeditioſi illi homines, Moſis juſſu, "illo in loco interfecti eſſe." Roſenmüller.

Ver. 40. Inſtead of ועלינו in the laſt member of this verſe, I ſuſpect that we ſhould read והעלינו, *lead us up*: but all the verſions favour the preſent reading.

Ver. 44. *They preſumptuouſly inſiſted.* So I render the word יעפלו. Jerom ſeems to have read יאפלו, which he renders *contenebrati*—But Sep. διαβιασομενοι—Still better Gr. Ven. εμετεω-ρισαν.—Our common verſion has *preſumed*, not badly: yet I think the word implies ſomewhat more than ſimple preſumption.—Some moderns give another turn to the phraſe; and render

* Adopted by Bate, nor corrected by Delgado. Purver has, "and know a rupture with me." † The old Geneva French verſion is ſtill harſher: "Afin que vous cognoiſſiez mon MENSONGE:" but by the laſt Reviſers changed into this paraphraſe: "Et vous connoîtrez, que j'ai interrompu le cours de mes benedictions ſur vous."—Le Cene: "Et vous eprouverez ce que c'eſt que de rompre avec moi."

יעפלו *they made no account* of what Moſes ſaid; *parvi fecerunt.* So Michaëlis and Roſenmüller. But Dathe agrees with me: "Illi vero pertinaciter contenderunt montem aſcendere."

Ver. 45. *So they returned to the camp.* This addition, which is in Sam. and Sep. is called a *gloſs*, by moſt modern interpreters, for the honour of the Hebrew text: I beg leave to differ from them, and believe it to be a genuine portion of the original.

CHAP. XV.

Ver. 38. *FRINGES.* ציצות. Sep. κρασπεδα—Vulg. *fimbrias*—Onk. כרוספדין, the Greek word chaldaized—and ſo equivalently the other verſions. Yet, perhaps, the word means rather a *flower-knot*, or *taſſel.* In Iſa. 28. 4. ציצת is evidently a *flower*; and in Ezek. 8. 3. it is a *lock* or *curl.*—The *blue* or *azure* ribband added to thoſe *fringes*, or *flowers*, being of the ſame colour with the high-prieſt's tunic, might be a continual admonition to the Iſraelites, that the whole nation was a *prieſtly kingdom*, and a *nation hallowed* to the Lord. See Exod. 19. 6. This is the obſervation of Le Clerc.

CHAP. XVI.

Ver. 1. THERE is a ſingular ellipſis in this verſe, according to the preſent reading and Maſoretic punctuation. The verb יקח has no objective! "And Korah took"—what? "Men," according to our common verſion, and moſt other modern verſions: but this is an arbitrary ſupplement, which has no parallel in the Hebrew Scriptures. Onkelos, Syr. Sam. verſ. Arab. Erp. and Perſ. ſeem to have taken יקח in a reflective ſenſe: *he took himſelf off:* i. e. *he diſſented*; or, as ſome of our Engliſh verſions, *he went apart.* But this is an inadmiſſible interpretation, although much prized by the Rabbins.—The Bab. Tharg. ſays that it was *a blue tunic*, which Korah *aſſumed*—no doubt to rival Aaron: but this is another Rabbinical conceit.—The Jeruſ. Tharg. ſupplies the word עיצה, *he took counſel*; no inept ſupplement, if it were authorized by examples.—Some, perhaps, may think that the Septuagint had ſome ſuch notion in view; as they render יקח ελαλησε.—Jerom knew not what to make of it; yet his good ſenſe taught him to give a ſuitable verſion: "Ecce autem Core," &c.—Let us now ſee how latter critics have untied the knot. Houbigant derives יקח from the Syriac קחא *to be quarrelſome:* but this is a forced derivation.—I would rather, with Dathe, derive it from קחח, *to murmur*; or from the Syr. נקח *crocitare*; which comes to the ſame; and requires not even the rejection of the point *dageſh* in *koph.*—If neither of theſe derivations be deemed plauſible, we muſt ſtill have recourſe to an *ellipſis:* and I know none more ſpecious than that of Tharg. Jeruſ. or that of Delgado, *he took a reſolution:* as we vulgarly ſay, *he took courage.*—In my verſion, I have, in imitation of Jerom*, given the meaning, without ſervilely adhering to the letter.

Ver. 11. *For, what is Aaron . . .* The original is ואהרן מה הוא, which perhaps might be better rendered, *For, what hath Aaron done?*—Delgado: *What have ye to do with Aaron?*

* And ſo, elegantly, Caſtalio: "Coierunt autem Cora," &c.—Nor is Bate's verſion much inferior (abating his fanciful orthography): "And Korah, the ſon of Ijer, the ſon of Ket, the ſon of Levi: and Dathan and Abiram ſons of "Aliab, and Aven the ſon of Pelet; ſons of Reuben, conſpired together," &c.

Ver. 15.

Ver. 15. *A ſingle aſs*, &c. Vulg. *ne aſſellum quidem.* But the Sam. copy has a different lection; namely, חמוד for חמור; the former of which ſignifies any thing *deſirable*: and this reading was followed by Sep. *επιθυμημα.* I prefer the preſent reading, on account of a ſimilar paſſage in 1 Sam. 12. 3.

Ver. 18. When I tranſlated this verſe, I was convinced that Sep. Syr. and Vulg. had read a better text than the preſent; and, conſequently, that the *vau* before משה was an interpolation. I accordingly rendered: "At the door of the convention-tent ſtood Moſes and "Aaron;" making יעמדו refer to them only, as the three juſt mentioned tranſlators * had done before me.—I am now perſuaded that I was miſled; and that the preſent text, which is the ſame in both Heb. and Sam. and followed by all the other verſions, is preferable.—Reform my verſion thus: "So they all took their cenſers, and put fire in them, and laid incenſe "on them, and ſtood at the door of the convention-tent, together with Moſes and Aaron;" and blot out the Explanatory Note: or rather remodel it thus: "The Septuagint and Syr. tranſlator, as well as Jerom, ſeem to have read no conjunction before *Moſes*; and refer the word *ſtood* to Moſes and Aaron only."

Ver. 30. *If the Lord deviſe a new thing.* אם בריאה יברא יהוה. *Si creaverit creationem Dominus.* The Septuagint verſion is ſingular. Αλλ' η εν φασματι † δειξει Κυριος. They are thought to have taken בריאה for two words, the prepoſition ב, and ריאה a verbal noun. Yet this is not a uſual form: nor have they ever elſewhere found the idea of φασμα in the root ראה: and indeed the word φασμα occurs, in their verſion, only here and in three other places. They alſo, inſtead of יברא, ſeem to have read, not יבדא, as Michaëlis and others imagine, but ירא or יראה in *Hipbil.*—Vulg. has, *Sin autem rem novam fecerit Dominus:* whence Michaëlis ſuppoſes he read בריאה יבדא. I believe he read as we now do, unleſs with one of Kennicott's MSS. he read חדשא after בריאה. Nor is there any need of altering the text; which is highly expreſſive of the idea meant to be conveyed.

Ver. 31. *Scarcely had he made an end of ſpeaking*, &c. If the event, recorded in this and the following verſes, really happened, I ſhould have no heſitation in calling it a miraculous event. But is there not reaſon to ſuſpect the literal truth of the narration? If thoſe men were actually ſwallowed up by the ſuddenly yawning earth, with all the circumſtances here told, in the ſight of all the Iſraelites; and after ſuch a previous appeal made by Moſes to Heaven for the divinity of his own miſſion, and the divinely inſtituted prieſthood of his brother; is it credible that, on the very next day, the people, the whole aſſembly, ſhould "murmur againſt Moſes and Aaron, ſaying: Ye have killed the people of the Lord?"—and that a new miracle ſhould be neceſſary to eſtabliſh the prieſthood of Aaron?—Indeed, when we conſider how fond of the marvellous, and how prone to blend hiſtory and fable, the Hebrew nation have at all times been, we cannot help reading with caution, and believing with difficulty, many very many of their wonderful narratives; which, if we found them in the hiſtorians of Greece or Rome, we would not fail to reject as fabulous. But never has it yet been ſhown, to my conviction at leaſt, that the Hebrew hiſtorians are not to be appretiated in the ſame

* Sep. και εσησαν παρα τας θυρας της σκηνης του μαρτυριου Μωυσης και Ααρων—Syr. וקמו קרם משכן ובנא מישא ואהרן—Vulg. *ſtantibus Moſe et Aaron*, &c. † So all the copies, ſave Ald. which has χασματι. But φασματι is the true reading, whatever be its meaning. See Copt. and Ital. apud Sabatier.

manner

manner as other hiſtorians; and that they were not equally liable both to miſtake, and miſrepreſent. This, I truſt, I ſhall be able to make appear, when, in my General Preface, I come to treat on the particular character of the Hebrew hiſtorians. At preſent I ſhall content myſelf with referring my reader, with reſpect to the occurrence here mentioned, to the free Remark of Eichhorn on Michaëlis's Notes, in the firſt volume of *Algemeine Bibliothek.* p. 911; or Roſenmüller's Latin account of it, in the ſecond volume of his *Scholia*, p. 214.

Ver. 32. *All the men who had joined Korah.* כל האדם אשר לקרח—Sep. *παντας τους ανθρωπους τους οντας μετα Κορε*—and ſo equivalently the other verſions; except Vulg. in which the whole comma is omitted. Our common verſion has, "all the men that *appertained* to Korah." But this muſt be reſtricted to thoſe only who were his accomplices; for his ſons were not included, as we learn from ch. 26. 11.

Ver. 38. *For a covering to the altar.* צפוי למזבח—Sep. *περιθεμαι τῳ θυσιαστηριῳ.* The altar ſeems to have been ſheathed over with the plates.

Ver. 40. This verſe, as it is at preſent, appears to me bald and defective. "That he be not "as Korah and his company: as the Lord ſaid to him by the hand of Moſes." Such is our common verſion, in which the words *to him* muſt be referred to *Eleazar* ſo far back as the beginning of ver. 39. or ſomething muſt be wanting after the word *company.* That want is ſupplied by Syr. which I have inſerted in my verſion; but not without ſome doubt of its authenticity. However, it can do no harm there; ſince it is properly diſtinguiſhed.

Ver. 44. *The Lord ſpoke to them.* The preſent Heb. and Sam. texts have *to Moſes,* אל משה: but Sep. more properly *προς Μωυσην και Ααρων.* So Syr. and Saadias: and it is clear from the context, that the words were addreſſed to both. I have therefore rendered *to them*; not to repeat the words *Moſes and Aaron* in the ſame verſe.

CHAP. XVII.

Ver. 7. *THE teſtimonial-tent.* אהל העדת—Sep. *σκηνη του μαρτυριου.* It is thus diſtinguiſhed from אהל מעוד, or the whole convention-tent.

CHAP. XVIII.

Ver. 7. THE diviſion of this verſe in the pointed Hebrew is evidently faulty. The *athnach,* or *colon,* ſhould be placed after עבדת, as it is in the Sam. text. See Houbigant. It is remarkable that Gr. Ven. ſo divides: *και λατρευσετε λατρειαν, δωρον δωσω την ἱερωσυνην ὑμων.* So rightly alſo the Perſic tranſlator. The Septuagint either read not אתן in their copy, or neglected to render it.

Ver. 12. *The choiceſt,* &c. כל חלב, *omnem pinguedinem.* The word חלב is often uſed to denote the beſt of every thing; much in the ſame manner as we uſe the word *cream.* Thus, the Greeks called the fineſt flour, and the fineſt bread, *the fat of the wheat.* Στεαρ πυρου. *ὁ καλλιστος σιτος—και αρτος.* Suidas.

Ver. 21. *All the tithes of Iſrael.* The Levites had no territory allowed to them but their cities and ſuburbs. But they were otherwiſe moſt plentifully provided for. Beſide the *tithes*

of all Iſrael, which muſt have been great indeed, conſidering the diſproportion of the number of Levites to that of the other tribes together; they had moreover the *firſt-fruits*, a *portion* of every victim whoſe blood was not carried into the ſanctuary, and a *ſhare* in every animal ſlain for common uſe. See Le Clerc's Commentary: and what can be ſaid in favour of thoſe regulations, and the *Levitical ariſtocracy*, in Michaëlis's *Moſaiſches Recht*. tom. i. ſect. 52. p. 283.

Ver. 27. *And this heave-offering ſhall be accounted*, &c. ונחשב לכם תרומתכם. But the Sam. copy has תרומתיכם * in the plural; and ſo Sep. *τα αφαιρεματα ὑμων*. And this, perhaps, is the better reading. But all the other verſions read in the ſingular.

Ver. 29. *Every heave-offering*. כל תרומת. But the word כל is wanting in 10 Heb. and 1 Chald. MS. and was not read by Sep. Vulg. Saad.

Ver. 31. *The reſt*. That is, what remained of the tithes and gift-offerings given to the Levites, after a part of the beſt of them had been aſſigned to Aaron, as an heave-offering.—In the Hebrew phraſeology, the third perſon is often put for either of the other two, as the occaſion requires: here in ver. 30. ללוים is for לכם.

CHAP. XIX.

Ver. 2. *AN heifer . . . which hath never borne the yoke*. The ſame uſage was obſerved by the Egyptians, Greeks, and Romans; teſtimonies of which the reader may ſee in Bochart †.

Ver. 3. *And cauſe her to be ſlaughtered*: ושחט אתה; by Montanus rendered *et mactabit eam*; and even by Jerom, *immolabit*; as if the victim were to be ſlain by Eleazar. But שחט, here and in other places, is to be conſidered either as an impersonal verb, or taken in a coactive ſenſe.—So Luther: *ſchlachten laſſen*—and Le Clerc: *mactari curabit*. This, however, did not pleaſe Houbigant; who thinks that the original reading was שחטו, becauſe the Septuagint render σφαξουσιν. But this is no certain proof, that they read in the plural: although they properly enough expreſſed an Hebrew ſingular, (as they elſewhere do,) that it might not be thought that *Eleazar* was the *ſlaughterer*. Our Engliſh tranſlators, then, did well, after their ſcrupulous manner, to add an Italic *one* before the words "ſhall ſlay." But it was not neceſſary to put it in Italics, as it is implied in שחט, according to the Hebrew idiom; as much as in the Latin *oportet me loqui*, "it behoves me to ſpeak," the word *it* is included in the word *oportet*.

Ver. 8. *Shall waſh his clothes in water*. The words "in water," במים, are wanting in one of Kennicott's MSS. and were at firſt wanting in four of De Roſſi's. They are alſo wanting in P. P. Levit. 16. 28. Nor were they read by Syr. Vulg. and moſt copies of Sep. But they are in all the other verſions down to Gr. Ven. incluſively.

Ver. 9. *A ſpecial purification-water*: מי נדה; by our tranſlators rendered "a water of ſepa-"ration;" after Pagninus. But Sep. ὑδωρ ραντισμου—Vulg. *aquam aſperſionis*: and ſo equivalently the other verſions, except Arab. Erp. and Gr. Ven. the former of which has מא אארש, *aqua piaculi*; the latter ὑδωρ μιασμου, of much the ſame import.—From a compariſon of the roots נדה and נזה, I am led to think, that the meaning of נדה here is *a purification* of a *ſpecial* kind; compoſed for the purpoſe of purifying perſons from certain ſtains, that required not the

* Although wrongly rendered in the Polyglott *elevatio veſtra*. † Hieroz. l. 11. c. 33.

interference

interference of the prieſt.—Houbigant follows the Vulgate; and blames Le Clerc for tranſlating *aquam impuritatis*: "contortè *aqua impuritatis* pro *aqua qua tollitur impuritas*."—But this is one of Houbigant's peeviſh obſervations. Had he forgotten that חטאת ſignifies both *ſin* and an *offering for ſin*: *peccatum*, et *oblatio qua tollitur peccatum*?

Ver. 12. It is juſtly obſerved by Delgado, that the laſt colon of this verſe is erroneouſly rendered in our vulgar tranſlation*, which runs thus: "but if he purify himſelf not the third day, "then the ſeventh day he ſhall not be clean:" nor was this error corrected by Purver or Bate. Sep. εαν δε μη αφαγνισθη τη ἡμερᾳ τη τριτη και τη ἡμερᾳ τη ἑβδομη, ου καθαρος εσται. Nothing can better expreſs the original than this verſion; with which agree Syr. and Onk. although their Latin verſions in Pol. make them ſpeak otherwiſe by being badly pointed.—Saadias, to prevent miſtakes, judged it proper to render thus: "and if he be not purified on *both* theſe (פידמא) "days, he ſhall not be clean."—So, latterly, Dathe: *quod ſi his diebus non fuerit expiatus, manet impurus*.—And Michaëlis: "entsündiget er ſich an dieſen beiden tagen nicht, ſo bleibt "er unrein."—There was no need of departing from Luther's more literal, and more elegant verſion.

CHAP. XX.

THIS chapter is not at all connected with the preceding one. What is related in it muſt have happened many years after; as has been well remarked by Delgado, who blames our Engliſh tranſlators for rendering the copulative *Then*. He would render *Now*: but I ſee little difference between *then* and *now*. The copulative *vau* is often, very often, a mere expletive, which in a tranſlation is better omitted.

Ver. 3. *Reproached them*. The preſent text has: *reproached Moſes*; or, as our common verſion has it, "chode with Moſes."—And ſo Sep. και ελοιδορειτο ὁ λαος τῳρος Μωυσην—and all the other verſions ſave Vulg. and Syr. What the former read is uncertain; as he paraphraſes thus: *Et, verſi in ſeditionem, dixerunt*, &c. But the latter has ונצו עמא עם מושא ועם אהרון; and this reading is ſtill preſerved in one of Kennicott's MSS. על משה ועל אהרן. This reading I have followed in my verſion: only, not to repeat "Moſes and Aaron," I have uſed the relative *them*.

Ver. 13. *By which the Lord glorified himſelf*. The order of the Hebrew is this: "Theſe "were the waters of Meriba, on account of which the children of Iſrael contended with the "Lord, and he was glorified by them, *or* in them." The word *them* is commonly referred to the Iſraelites: but I am inclined to think that *waters* are the antecedent; and have ſhaped my verſion accordingly.

Ver. 19. *In the highway*. במסלה. The Septuagint† ſeem to have read במסלע, which is ſtill the reading of 3 Sam. MSS. and was moſt probably the original reading of the Sam. text; as

* As well as in all the preceding ones from Tindall downwards: and ſo indeed moſt modern tranſlators have rendered; miſled, I preſume, by Jerom, who has: "ſi die tertio aſperſus non fuerit, ſeptimo non poterit emundari." Luther, however, followed a better guide, the Septuagint verſion, and has accordingly well rendered: "und wo er ſich nicht "am dritten tage und am ſiebenten tage entsündiget, ſo wird er nicht rein werden." Junius, too: *quod ſi non purgabit ſe die tertio et die ſeptimo, non erit mundus*. And Diodati, in his marginal verſion: *ſe non ſi ſara purificato al terzo giorno ne al ſetimo, non ſara netto*.

† Παρα το ορος παρελευσομεθα.

it is preſerved in the Sam. verſion. But as none of the other verſions favour this reading, and as the other reading appears to be preferable, I have followed it; although I would not, with our lexicographers, derive מסלה from סלל, but from מסל, which in Arab. denotes *a direct line, an open way.*

CHAP. XXI.

Ver. 1. *BY the way of Atharim.* דרך האתרים. Sep. ὁδον Αθαρειμ*—Vulg. *per exploratorum viam:* followed by moſt interpreters, among which our own: "by the way of the ſpies." This is ſuppoſed to be the way by which the Iſraelitic *ſpies* went up to explore the land of Chanaan. But אתר is not the term for a ſpy, nor can it regularly be derived from תור. Michaëlis thinks it ſignifies *place*, from its having that meaning in Chald. Syr. and Samaritan; and would render: "the king of Arad hearing that the Iſraelites were on the way to thoſe places." But I doubt very much if the Hebrew will bear ſuch a verſion, without an אל after דרך. The prefix ה, indeed, would induce one to ſuſpect that אתרים were an appellative: but proper names have ſometimes that prefix: and if האתרים were a tribe, or petty nation, I ſhould render, "by the "way of the Atharites:" but the name of no ſuch people occurring elſewhere, I thought it beſt to retain the Hebrew name, with Sep. Saadias, and Dathe.

Ver. 3. *Whom, with their cities, they devoted* to deſtruction. Theſe cities muſt have been only thoſe that touched on the Deſert. Compare Joſh. 12. 14. Shuckford deemed the firſt colon of this verſe an interpolation; and Bp. Law ſeems to have been of the ſame opinion.

Ver. 8. *Fiery ſerpents.* הנחשים השרפים. Sep. τους οφεις τους θανατουντας, *deadly ſerpents*—Vulg. *ignitos ſerpentes*—and ſo equivalently Onkelos and both Arabs—Syr. *dire ſerpents*—Michaëlis takes שרף to be the *ceraſtes*, or *regulus*. I believe it to be the *dipſas*, otherwiſe called *preſter*; and ſo the word is here rendered by Gr. Ven. τους οφεις τους ϖρηστηρας.

Ver. 14. The fragment of ſuppoſed poetry, contained in this and the next verſe, has always been deemed a moſt difficult paſſage; and various attempts have been made to explain it, which I will not now detail †; as I flatter myſelf that my own explanation will, on examination, appear to be the true one. I change not a ſingle letter in the text: I only read אתהב in one word, with ſeven MSS. and exclude the *vau* before אשד with the Sam. copy. I then point after מלחמות, and thus diſtribute the remainder:

יהוה אתהב בסופה׳
ואת הנחלים ארנון אשד׳
הנחלים אשר נטה לשבת־ער׳
ונשען לגבול מואב.

Dominus ſe dedit in turbine, et torrentes Arnon effudit; torrentes quæ deflexerunt ad Sheboth-Ar, et declinârunt ad limitem Moab.—The people were in want of water. A tempeſt of rain ſwelled the Arnon, the channel of which was probably dry before: and this torrent ſinking along the adjacent plain afforded wells of water whereſoever they dug for it, from Mathana to the vale of Moab. This, I think, explains the whole paſſage from ver. 13 to the end of the chapter.

* Gr. Ven. ὁδῳ των Αθαριων.

† I ſhall only give the verſion of Sep. becauſe it is ſingular: Δια τουτο λεγεται εν τῳ βιβλιῳ· Πολεμος του Κυριου την Ζωοβ εφλογισε, και τους χειμαρρους Αρνων. Inſtead of וחב, they are ſuppoſed to have read והב, and to have taken it in a figurative ſenſe. But whence had they εφλογισε? I am perſuaded their text is here corrupted; or they muſt have read very differently from our preſent Hebrew text.

I can

I can ſee but two critical objections, that can be made to my verſion. The firſt is, that אתוהב is not in the Hebrew but in the Aramean form. But this is not the only place where this form is obſerved: and here we may conſider it as an *archaiſm*. It may alſo be objected, that I give to נטה and נשען a plural ſignification: but every ſcholar knows that, in Hebrew, this is no uncommon *enallage*; eſpecially when words are uſed diſtributively. Thus, Job 12. 7. "Aſk the beaſts, and *it* (that is, *each of the beaſts*) will *teach thee*"—שאל נא בהמות ותרך.—So Jerem. 35. 14. חוקם את דברי יהונדב: "The *words* (i. e. *every word*) of Jonadab *was* "confirmed."

Ver. 16. *Thence* was obtained *a well.* משם בארה: commonly rendered: "Thence *they* "*went* to Beer." But not ſo Sep. Και εκειθεν το φρεαρ—Vulg. *Ex eo loco apparuit puteus*—Onk. מתמן אתיהיבת להון בירא, *Thence a well was given to them.*—Syr. alſo took בארה for an appellative, and in the nominative caſe; and ſo Tharg. Bab. The reſt, indeed, conſider באר here as a place, on account of the ה final: but I take בארה to be an Aramean *archaiſm*, as well as אתוהב.

Ver. 17. *A well hath ſprung up! Reſound applauſe!* The preſent text is עלי באר ענו לה, by our tranſlators rendered: "Spring up, O well! Sing ye unto it:" and ſo the word עלי was underſtood by Onk. Tharg. Syr. Saad. and Perſ.*—Sep. took עלי for a prepoſition; επι του φρεατος: and, what is very remarkable, the Gr. of Venice has, likewiſe, επι φρεως. But the Sam. reading עלה I take to be the true reading, although here anomalous: as באר is elſewhere a feminine; and the ſyntax would require עלתה. I am perſuaded, however, that באר is here the nominative, not the vocative caſe; and that עלה is in the præterite, not in the imperative mood. Indeed, the ſenſe to me appears to require this. It was natural for the Iſraelites to ſing on the firſt appearance of water: but who would ſing to water before it appeared?

Ver. 18. *A well which the chiefs diſcovered.* באר חפרוה שרים. I take חפר to be here in the meaning *inveſtigare, ſcrutari.* The chiefs ſought and diſcovered the proper places to dig for water; and the people digged, in the places pointed out to them by the chiefs: or theſe, perhaps, began the work, which the people afterwards finiſhed. I muſt here remark, that the Septuagint verſion is groſsly miſpointed in the Aldine and Roman editions: εξηρχετε αυτῳ φρεαρ· ωρυξαν αυτο αρχοντες: and the Latin verſion in Pol. follows this faulty diviſion. Not ſo Compl. which has a comma after αυτῳ: but better ſtill Grabe, who puts a colon after αυτῳ.

Ib. *The volunteers of the people:* נדיבי העם—Sep. βασιλεις εθνων—Vulg. *duces multitudinis*—and ſo equivalently Syr. Onk. Tharg. Saad.—Our tranſlators imitated them: "the nobles of "the people:" and ſimilarly moſt modern tranſlators, down to Dathe and Michaëlis. I am perſuaded, that there is neither *kings*, nor *princes*, nor *nobles*, in the ſentence; and that נדיבי העם means ſuch of the people as volunteered themſelves to dig the wells marked out by the chiefs. So Erpen. and the Perſic tranſlator; and ſo admirably well Gr. Ven. ευεργεται τω λεω.

Ib. *By delving with their ſtaves.* במחקק במשענותם. The word במחקק is commonly rendered, *with the lawgiver*; or, as our public verſion, "*by the direction of* the lawgiver." Purver: *by means of the lawgiver*†.—The original and literal meaning of חקק is *fodere, exſcalpere, excidere:* and

* The Vulg. *aſcendat puteus* is equivalent to an imperative. † The antients vary. Sep. εν τῃ βασιλειᾳ αυτων—But a MS. has τῳ βασιλει, a more probable reading.—Vulg. *in datore legis*.—Onk. ſeems to have read מחקקים without

and in that ſenſe מחקק is to be taken here. The Sam. copy reads a *vau* before במשענותם; wrongly, I think: at leaſt, it muſt be accounted an expletive.

Ib. *From the wilderneſs to Mathana*, &c. This abrupt comma is commonly rendered: "And "from the wilderneſs *they went* to Mattanah; or, as I write it, *Mathana*. Inſtead of ממדבר the Septuagint read מבאר or מבארה, as they render *και απο φρεατος*. This reading is followed by Houbigant, Dathe, and Michaëlis; and is indeed very plauſible. Yet I am inclined to prefer the common reading, which is alſo that of the Sam. copy; and of all the verſions, ſave Sep.—The meaning of the whole paſſage is this, I think: *Mathana*, which denotes *a gift*, is the torrent of rain which the Lord gave them in a tempeſt from the mountains at the ſource of the Arnon. This torrent ſupplied them with water, from the time when they left the wilderneſs, mentioned in ver. 11, until they came to the vale of Moab, mentioned ver. 20.—Such I take to be the genuine meaning of the text; of which Dr. Kennicott has given a verſion (de ſa façon) in his Critical Remarks, which the reader may ſee at p. 66; and, if he like it better than mine, let him adopt it inſtead of mine.

Ver. 27—30. Another piece of ſententious poetry, not eaſy to be underſtood. It is uſhered in by theſe words: על כן יאמרו משלים—Sep. *Δια τουτο ερουσιν οι αινιγματιζοντες**—Vulg. *Idcirco dicitur in proverbio.* And ſo equivalently the other verſions; and ſo our Engliſh tranſlation: "wherefore they that ſpeak in proverbs." But all this gives a faint idea of the meaning of משלים. The word משל, as a verb, ſignifies to ſpeak *nobly*, and *figuratively*: and what elſe is this but to *poetize*? The language of the poets, particularly of the oriental poets, is often highly *parabolical*; or, to ſpeak more properly, *hyperbolical*; and hence their ſayings may be called *parables*: but *proverbs*, in its common acceptation, is an improper term. The piece of poetry here quoted is by ſome thought to be that of an Amorite bard, who related the conqueſts of Sihon over the Moabites. I cannot be of that opinion: I believe it to be the work of a Hebrew poet; who, after the defeat of Sihon, and the overthrow of his capital city, excites his countrymen to rebuild and repair it, as the ſtrongeſt city of that territory, which had formerly defeated the Moabites, and might ſtill be made a formidable rival to Ar. Conſidered in this light, it is a beautiful fragment of an old ballad, quoted by the writer of the Pentateuch: but ſuch a quotation could not be made by Moſes; although Moſes may have compoſed the ballad.

Ver. 28. *Which conſumed Ar of Moab.* Ar was the capital city of the Moabites; which had been, probably, ravaged by Sihon. There is, however, a various reading here, which is not improbable. Inſtead of ער the Sam. copy has עד; and this is the reading of 2 Heb. MSS. and was at firſt that of 4 more. So alſo Sep. εως.—Syr. is alſo ſuppoſed by De Roſſi to have had before him the ſame reading: but this, I think, is a miſtake. The Polyglott edition has indeed

without the prepoſition. The reſt paraphraſe the beſt they can. The Perſic tranſlator alone appears to me to have rightly rendered the paſſage: "The volunteers of the people digged it, by digging with their ſtaves."—Nor badly, although barbarouſly, Gr. Ven. *εν τυπτωσιν*; agreeable to which is the Sam. verſion.—The word משענות is rendered *ſtaves* by all the antients; except Sep. in which we find *εν τω κυριευσαι αυτων*!——It is yet common among ſhepherds, in ſome parts of this iſland, to dig wells with ſtaves; which are pointed for that purpoſe: I have ſeen them at ſuch work. In the ſandy regions of the Eaſt, wells are eaſily dug. Sometimes water is found at the depth of a foot and a half; ſometimes at two feet. See Niebuhr, vol. i. p. 103. French edition.

** Gr. Ven. Δια, φαιεν οι παραβολεις.*

עד instead of ער; but the tranſlator could not have ſo read in his copy, as he makes עד a town of Moab: ואכלת לעד דמואב. I have, then, no doubt of לער being the original reading of Syr. although the diacritic point has been changed in the copy followed in the Polyglott.—Singular is the reading of Gr. Ven. *τον Αρνον τȣ Μωαβȣ*.

Ib. *Which devoured Bamoth-Arnon.* The preſent text has בלי במות ארנן: by our tranſlators rendered "the lords of the high-places of Arnon."—Vulg. *habitatores excelſorum Arnon.*—Onkelos and the Thargumiſts underſtand בעלי to be the *prieſts* of the high-places of Arnon. I believe that the Septuagint have followed the true reading בערה, *κατεπιε ϛηλας Αρνων*. They render במות *ϛηλας*: but as I take במות־ארנן to be the name of a place, the ſame with that mentioned ver. 19, I have retained the Hebrew words.

Ver. 30. This verſe has, in my apprehenſion, been ſtrangely miſunderſtood and miſinterpreted. The text is ונירם *אבד חשבן עד דיבן ונשים עד †תנפח ‡אשר ||עד מדיבא—by Montanus rendered; *Et jugum eorum periit, Cheſbon uſque ad Dibon, et deſolari fecimus uſque ad Nophach, quæ uſque ad Medeba:* by our Engliſh tranſlators: "We have ſhot at them: Heſhbon "is periſhed even unto Dibon, and we have laid them waſte even unto Nopach, which *reacheth* "unto Medeba §."—But both theſe verſions, and indeed almoſt all modern tranſlations, are, to me, unintelligible.—Let us ſee what light can be derived from the antients. Sep. *Και το ϭπερμα αυτων απολειται Εϭεβων, εις Δαιβων· και αι γυναικες ¶ ετι προσεξεκαυσαν πυρ επι Μωαβ.* This, at firſt ſight, appears a very ſingular verſion: but it admits a conſiſtent meaning, and can be plauſibly defended. Some critics have imagined that they read in their copy נין inſtead of ניר, becauſe they render *ϭπερμα*: but *ϭπερμα*, I ſuſpect, is here to be taken for the *ſeed of the field*; or the *corn-fields* themſelves: and in that caſe there is no need of ſuppoſing that they read otherwiſe than we now do; the vowel points only being changed. So far, then, the Septuagint verſion is correct and juſt: and the following words are alſo juſtly rendered; but the verſion is miſpointed and miſtranſlated in the Polyglott. The comma ſhould not be placed after *απολειται*, as it is in Ald. Rom. and Alex. but after *Εϭεβων*, or omitted altogether as in Compl. which is, in many places, more correctly printed than the other editions. Then, *απολειται* is miſtranſlated *periit*; whereas it ſhould be *perdidit*, *Εϭεβων* being the nominative. Hitherto, then, all is well: but how juſtify the remaining part of their verſion? Here indeed I think they made ſome miſtakes: they took נשים to be a ſingle word, meaning *wives*, *αι γυναικες*: they took עד before דיבן for a *conjunction:* they read with Sam. הנפח and אש; made the former a verb in the ſingular** with a nominative plural, and אש its objective: and, laſtly, they, with Sam. read על after אש, and מואב for מידבה. Their verſion then might, in Engliſh, be rendered thus: "Their corn-fields as far as Dibon, they (that is, the Heſh-"bonites) deſtroyed; and their women fanned the fire †† againſt Moab."—Now, who will ſay,

* Sam. better, אבדה—† Sam. הנפח—‡ Sam. אש—|| Sam. על. § Cov. "Their glory is come to nought," &c. —Matth. "Their light is out," &c.—The reſt down to Gen. incluſively: "Their empire is loſt," &c.—Ainſworth and Bate: "Their lamp is deſtroyed," &c.—Purver: "We ſhooting at them," &c.—Delgado contents himſelf with obſerving, that expoſitors differ ſo much about the ſenſe, that he thinks himſelf obliged to give two verſions. One of theſe is: "And as we ſhot at them Heſhbon periſhed," &c. The other: "And their dominion, even that of Heſhbon, "periſhed," &c.——I omit reporting the other foreign verſions, which all agree with one or other of the above.

¶ Comp. Ald. Alex. and ſome MSS. add *αυτων*: but it is wanting in Copt. ** Unleſs they perhaps read הנפחו.

†† The radical meaning of נפח is *ſufflare*, *inſufflare*; and hence *ſuccendere ignem*.

that

that this is not a plauſible verſion?—More plauſible, and more probable, it certainly is than any other antient verſion; in the ſuppoſition that they had the genuine text before them, and miſread it not.—But, every thing conſidered, I am inclined to think that the preſent text is correct; except, perhaps, that the Sam. readings אברה—רופח—על (which laſt is the reading of one Heb. and one Chald. MS.) are preferable to אבד—נפח—עד. But this is not of much conſequence: ſo I leave the text as it is; and thus arrange it:

וניר֥ם אֹבֵ֖ד חשבון֙ עַ֣ר דיבֹ֔ן ונשי֖ם שֹׁ֣ר נפח֑ אשר עַ֖ד מידבא׃

That Heſhbon is here in the nominative caſe, is clear from ver. 28; for it is from Heſhbon that "a fire went forth to deſtroy Moab, and from the city of Sihon a flame;" not certainly to conſume itſelf, but to conſume the territory, and even the capital, of Moab. This is the firſt ſtep towards clearing the paſſage. Then, אבד, or rather אברה, is to be conſidered as an active verb, or in *Phiel**, and pointed as above. Thirdly, ניר is evidently a noun, as it was taken by all the antients down to Gr. Ven. and, from the context, muſt here mean *full fields of corn*†; as נשי, I think, denotes *fallow fields*; from נשש, which in Syr. and Arab. ſignifies *terra iners, inſeminata*. On theſe preſumptions I have formed my verſion; which is, at leaſt, intelligible, and conſiſtent with the context. Let thoſe, who ſhall be diſpleaſed with it, frame a better‡.

CHAP. XXII.

ABBOT Jeruſalem and ſome other modern critics are of opinion, that Moſes inſerted the hiſtory of Balaam, as an epiſode, from Moabite memoirs, for the purpoſe of obviating preſſing difficulties; in the ſuppoſition that Moſes himſelf was the original writer. I believe, it was written, not by Moſes, but by the compiler of the Pentateuch, from ſuch traditional ſtories, or ſcraps of written documents, as he could find. Indeed, it has all the air of a legendary tale.

Ver. 5. *The river of the land of Ammon.* The preſent text has הנהר ארץ בני עמו: "The "river of the land of the children of his people." And ſo Sep. Onk. both Arabs. Perſ. and Gr. Ven. But Sam. Vulg. Syr. and ſeveral MSS. have עמך; which is, in my opinion, preferable to the other, were it merely for this reaſon: that it is an odd way to define a man's country, by calling it the land of his own people. See Kennicott's Remarks; and Houbigant *in loc.* It is objected by Le Clerc and Roſenmüller, that the *Euphrates*, the river here meant, was at too great a diſtance from the Ammonites to be called "a river of their land." But it is very uncertain how nearly the borders of Ammon were to that river: and the word על, as Houbigant remarks, may be rendered *towards*.

Ver. 6. *Curſe for me this people.* The antients believed that *bleſſing* or *curſing*, by thoſe who were accounted *prophets*, was of great conſequence. See Le Clerc *in loc.*

* The Perſic tranſlator ſaw this, but miſtook its nominative. † So Syr. underſtood the Heb. word: and Gr. Ven. has the very word νεωμα. ‡ I ſhall here add four other verſions, for the ſake of their authors.—That of Houbigant is: *Eorum culta novalia perdidit Heſebon, uſque ad Dibon; vaſtata ſunt uſque ad Nophe, verſus Medaba.* —That of Kennicott: "But we have caſt upon them deſtruction, from Heſhbon unto Dibon: and we have laid waſte "unto Nophah; the fire was unto Medeba." See his Remarks, p. 67.—That of Dathe: *Sagittis eos confecimus, periit Heſbon uſque ad Dibonem, vaſtavimus uſque ad Nophacum, conflagravimus omnia uſque ad Medebam.*—That of Michaëlis: "Ihre ſchönen aecker ſind verwüſtet, von Heſbon bis nach Dibon, verwüſtet bis nach Nofach; trümmern zer- "ſtörter ſtädte ſind bis nach Medeba."——*Quodvis, eligite.*

Ver. 8.

Ver. 8. *What the Lord ſhall ſay to me.* כאשר ידבר יהוה אלי. This proves, either that *Jehovah* was Balaam's God, or that the hiſtorian has put words in Balaam's mouth, which he could not utter. See the Rem. on Levit. 1. 3. The conduct of Balaam, on this occaſion, is thus explained by Jeruſalem, and his followers. They ſuppoſe Balaam to have been an egregious impoſtor, who had acquired the reputation of being a prophet, and made a public traffic of his divinatory art. He might have learned from Balak's meſſenger the ſuperior ſtrength of the Iſraelite army, and perhaps their fame had reached him before that period: hence it was an eaſy matter for him to foretell that the Moabites would be overcome, if they ſhould go to war. If therefore he had complied with Balak's wiſh, and curſed the Iſraelites, he ran the riſk of ſeeing his curſe ineffectual, and his art detected. But, by bleſſing them, he loſt nothing of his former fame: on the contrary, even the Moabites themſelves would be inclined to give him more credit, than if he had curſed their enemies. For that purpoſe, he artfully feigns frequent conſultations with God, and delivers his own ideas for divine oracles.—Theſe ſuppoſitions granted, it is thought that the difficulties attending his hiſtory are removed *.

Ver. 18. *Balak's chiefs.* The preſent text has עבדי בלק: *Balak's ſervants:* and ſo Onk. Tharg. Syr. Perſ. Arab. Erp. and Gr. Ven. But I prefer the reading of Sep. שרי בלק, which is that of one of Kennicott's MSS. and was followed by Saadias. In Vulg. the comma is wanting: it has only *Reſpondit Balaam:* but nothing for שרי בלק (or עבדי) ויאמר אל.

Ib. *Were Balak to give me his houſe-full of ſilver,* &c. Balaam affects to be a perſon of the higheſt integrity and diſintereſtedneſs †; yet it appears lucre was in his heart. See verſes 22 and 32.

Ver. 22. *God was incenſed againſt him.* I ſhall here give the ſubſtance of Roſenmüller's Note: "Qui veram hiſtoriam hic narrari putant, ii difficultate inexplicabili impediuntur; quo-"modo nempe Deus iraſci potuerit, quod Bileamus proficiſceretur; quum tamen ipſe profi-"ciſci permiſerit ver. 20. Nonnulli dicunt Deum ideo eſſe iratum Bileamo, quod is iverit "animo nocendi; alii, poſt Clericum, verba illa verſûs 20. ſignificâſſe: *permitto tibi proficiſci* "*cum legatis, ſi modo abs te nihil petant, quod ſit præceptis meis contrarium.* Verum equidem "fateor me non intelligere, quid ſibi Clericus cum hac difficultatis ſolutione voluerit: nec "hujuſmodi reſponſionibus erit opus, ſi Jeruſalemii ſententiam adſumamus." Now I confeſs, I do not ſee how, even in the hypotheſis of Jeruſalem, the difficulty is ſolved. Admitting the ſtory to be a Moabite ſtory, and in part a fiction, ſtill the writer would feign with ſome degree of conſiſtency. A better way, then, to reconcile ver. 20. with ver. 22. is to admit, in the latter, the addition in Saadias תם אשתד עצב אללה למציה טאמעא: *Then God was wroth, becauſe he* (Balaam) *was going with a covetous diſpoſition.* So Peter, 2 Ep. 2. 15. ὃς μισθον αδικιας ηγαπησεν.

Ver. 23. The ſtory of Balaam's aſs has often been an object of ridicule: and the critic above mentioned, Jeruſalem, thinks that it was all a fiction of Balaam's, to ſave himſelf from obloquy if he ſhould bleſs, inſtead of curſing, the Iſraelites ‡. To me, there appears nothing ſtrange

* "Si, his obſervationibus ducibus, quæ nunc ſequuntur legamus, nullæ in iis difficultates obviæ erunt." Roſenmüller. † "Simulat Bileamus ſe hominem eſſe integerrimum, et ab omni lucri cupiditate alieniſſimum: id quod "ſine dubio legatis Balaki eo majorem de illo opinionem injicere debebat." Roſenmüller. ‡ "Si recordamur "eorum, quæ ſupra ad ver. 8. dicta ſunt, ſponte intelligamus totam hanc, quæ nunc ſequitur, narrationem de aſinâ, a

ſtrange in the ſtory of the aſs, but the manner of telling it: and that ceaſes to be wonderful, when we recollect the oriental mode of narrating. Balaam is riding on his aſs, on as yet a doubtful errand: the aſs ſtartles at ſomething, and turns aſide from the way; thruſts her maſter's leg againſt a wall, and at length falls down under him. All this he takes for a bad omen, and a ſign that his journey is not agreeable to God: God is thence conceived to be angry with him, and an imaginary dialogue enſues between God and Balaam, as had before been ſuppoſed to be held between Balaam and his aſs. I believe there are few gentlemen who have not held ſuch dialogues with their horſes. I have frequently converſed with mine: and, indeed, an occurrence once happened to me not unſimilar to what happened to Balaam. I was riding on a favourite little mare, in a very narrow path, which had a high wall on one ſide and a deep rapid river on the other. All at once my palfrey ſtopped ſhort, and wanted to wheel about and return. It was not, however, an angel which ſhe ſaw—although it had wings: it was a dead crow lying in the path; and which, without alighting, I could not get my mare to paſs. I was ſcarcely on her back again, when, a looſe ſtone falling from the top of the wall about three paces before her noſe, ſhe jumped aſide with vehemence; and although ſhe did not thruſt my leg againſt the wall, ſhe threw herſelf and me into the river: and if ſhe had not been an excellent ſwimmer, we ſhould have both been drowned. It may be readily ſuppoſed, that I was angry. Whether, if I had had a ſword in my hand, I ſhould have threatened to ſlay my mare, I know not: but certain it is, that I ſcolded her egregiouſly, and would probably have beaten her moſt unmercifully, if this ſame ſtory of Balaam's aſs had not naturally preſented itſelf to my view. My poor pony ſeemed to ſay, in a piteous tone: "Am I not "thine own *mare*, upon which thou haſt ridden ſince ever I came into thy poſſeſſion? Was I "ever wont to do to thee ſo before?" This ſhe ſeemed to ſay as effectually, as if God had opened her mouth: ſo effectually, that I inſtantly ſaid "No," and gently lowered the ſuſpended whip.—Now, if the manners of our country reſembled the manners of Balaam's country, and our ſtyle of writing their ſtyle; and if I had, like Balaam, been reputed a prophet or ſoothſayer; and, in that character, been ſent for by the king or his miniſters to curſe the French (for example); and if this accident had happened to me on the road; would it not have been conſidered as a ſign from heaven, that my journey was not a lucky one? And perhaps I ſhould have been inclined to ſtop, and return; unleſs the *wages of unrighteouſneſs* had tempted me to go on: in which caſe, I ſhould, moſt probably, have imagined that an angel of God bade me proceed, &c. &c.—Such an occurrence would, by an oriental hiſtorian, be narrated in the dramatic manner in which we have the ſtory of Balaam's aſs, and many other ſuch ſtories in the Hebrew writings*.

Ver. 32. *I am come out to oppoſe thee.* אנכי יצאתי לשטנך. So the Sam. copy, with Sep. and moſt of the ant. verſions. The preſent Heb. has לשטן: but the final *caph* has been dropt, from its

"Bileamo fictam eſſe hoc fine, ne ab ejus auctoritate detraheretur, ſi Iſraelitis bene præcaturus eſſet. Sunt enim huic "hiſtoriæ tam multa inter ſe contraria, ut qui eam ſine præconcepta opinione legat, primo ſtatim intuitu videat eam eſſe "viri verſuti figmentum, quod homines duntaxat inculti et ſuperſtitione occœcati credere potuerunt." Roſenmüller.—But is there not here a ſort of contradiction? If Balaam were *vir verſutus*, he would, one might think, have made a better ſtory. It is true, however, that ſtory-makers often overdo.

* If the ſtory of Balaam and his aſs be a literal ſtory, we may ſay with Le Clerc: *Aut Bileamus inſaniebat, aut neſcio quid de brutis ſentiebat.* See the ſtory of *Mycillus* and his *cock*, in Lucian.

contiguity

contiguity to the ſame letter in the next word. This muſt, probably, have happened before the books were written in Chaldee characters; or, at leaſt, before final letters were diſtinguiſhed from others.

Ib. *Becauſe I know that thou goeſt with an evil intention.* The preſent Heb. is כי ירט הדרך לנגדי: but Sam. כי הרע דרכך לנגדי: literally rendered, "becauſe evil is thy way before me." But the דרע is with ſome probability ſuppoſed to be a ſubſtitute made by the Sam. copyiſt* for an obſcure word, ירט, the meaning of which, as it occurs only twice (here and in Job 16. 11.) is not well known. In the common editions of Sep. it is rendered ακ αξεια: but in the Glaſg. Octateuch, and in ſome other MSS. it is ακ ευθεια; and this is the reading of the Coptic verſion. The Italic is loſt.—Vulg. *perverſa*—which correſponds with Sep.—Both may have read as Sam.—The other ant. tranſlators ſeem to have read ירט; which they took for a verb, but rendered it variouſly.—What, then, is its preciſe meaning? By comparing the root רטט with the Syr. רוט and the Arab. ורט, we may venture to ſay, that it ſignifies *raſh*, *devious*, *perverſe*, and ſuch like terms. In my verſion I have ſoftened the figure into its equivalent Engliſh meaning.

Ver. 33. *The aſs ſaw me*, &c. "Quis hic non videt inconcinnum hominis figmentum?" Roſenmüller.

Ver. 39. *Kiriath-huzoth.* קרית חצות—Sam. קרית חיצות—Sep. πολεις επαυλεων †—Vulg. *urbem quæ in extremis regni ejus finibus erat:* and if the root be חוץ, as moſt probably it is, this paraphraſe of Jerom's gives the meaning. I choſe to retain the Hebrew name.

CHAP. XXIII.

Ver. 1. *BUILD here ſeven altars*, &c. One cannot help here obſerving, with the author of *Comment. and Eſſays*, &c. that "there is a remarkable reſemblance, in the number and "kind of animals, between this ſacrifice of Balaam, and that which the Sibyl commanded "Æneas to offer. Æn. vi. 47."

Nunc grege de intacto ſeptem mactare juvencos
Præſtiterit, totidem lectas de more bidentes.

Ver. 3. *Holocauſts.* The preſent text has עלת; but Sam. with more than 30 MSS. have עלתי: ſo alſo Syr. Yet Sep. with the other verſion read in the ſingular ‡.

Ib. *Now he went in anxious ſilence.* וילך שפי, without a ſingle various lection.—But what is the meaning of שפי? By Sep. it is rendered ευθιων—Vulg. *velociter* §—Onk. יחידי, *alone*—Tharg. Bab. נחין, *crooked:* he adds by way of explanation כחיויא, *like a ſerpent:* and perhaps the Sam. tranſlator had the ſame notion, when he rendered מכמן—Tharg. Jeruſ. בלב שפי, badly rendered in Pol. *corde contrito:* I think it ſhould be rendered *animo tranquillo*—Syr. שפיאית, rendered in Pol. *ſincerè:* but which, I am inclined to think, has here the ſame ſignification as

* Yet I am rather inclined to think, that it has been an overſight of ſome copyiſt, whether a Samaritan or a Jew. In the ant. alphabet the *iota* might be miſtaken for a *hé*, and the *teth* for an *ain*; and *vice verſa*. What militates moſt againſt the Sam. lection is the prefix before רע. † They read וחצרות, and this is the reading of Syr.

‡ The addition which, on the authority of Sep. I have inſerted in this verſe, I firmly believe to have ſtood in the original: but the reader may think otherwiſe. § He ſeems to have had in view the Arab. ספא.

in Chald.—Saad. פי חדף, which why it is rendered in Pol. *tranquillè*, I own I cannot conceive. I think it ſhould be rendered *in feſtinantia*, or *feſtinanter*, which correſponds with Vulg.—Arab. Erp. and Perſ. follow Onkelos—and Gr. Ven. has μετεωρω.

Of modern interpreters, Pagninus followed Onkelos, and was followed by Münſter, Caſtalio, the Tigurines, the French Genevans, the Spaniſh of Ferrara, and that of De Reyna. But Junius, Diodati, the Dutch, and our common Engliſh verſion, follow R. D. Kimhi, who thinks that שפי ſignifies a high-place here, as it does in Iſaiah and Jeremiah: as if Balaam had gone to a higher place, than where the altars were, to conſult God.—Others, on the contrary, think that שפי ſignifies *a low-place, a plain*; and the Septuagint are ſuppoſed to have ſo underſtood it, ſince they render ευθειαν*.—Michaëlis, followed by Schulz and Roſenmüller, joins the two ideas. The place, to which Balaam went, was a plain open ſpace on the mountain, *locus planus in monte*, "eine freie, mit keiner waldung bewachſene höhe des berges."

All theſe tranſlators, ſave thoſe who follow Onk. or Vulg. ſuppoſe שפי to be *in regimen*, and ſupply the prepoſition אל. I confeſs that this ellipſis appears to me, as it did to Dathe, a very harſh one, although it has been plauſibly defended by Storr†. I think שפי is in concord, whatſoever meaning we give to it.—If it be here taken in its common Hebrew acceptation, we muſt, with Montanus, render *elatus*; "he went *elato capite*:" i. e. *confidently, ſecurely*: but as, in this whole chapter, there are manifeſt *archaiſms*, I am inclined to think, with Dathe, that the true meaning of שפי is *anxious, ſolicitous*: although I would not refer it to the Chald. שפה; but to the Chald. and Arab. ספה.

Ver. 10. *The multitude.* את רבע: commonly rendered *the fourth part*, and ſuppoſed to be in the genitive caſe. I cannot ſo think: the paralleliſm would thereby be loſt; and the conjecture of Venema, although deemed unneceſſary by Roſenmüller and Dathe, is confirmed by 4 Sam. MSS. which, inſtead of ומספר, have ומי ספר, or מי ספר; and ſo read Sep. και τις εξαριθμησεται δημους Ισραηλ? Saadias alſo muſt have had ſuch a reading in his text; or have taken מספר for the participle of Phiel: which indeed it may be: and in that caſe the מי of the preceding comma is elegantly underſtood.—For the reſt, I think, with Houbigant‡, that רבע, or rather מרבע, the Sam. lection, does not mean *a fourth part*; but *the whole people*.

Ib. *And like theirs be my latter end.* יתהי אחריתי כמהו. The Septuagint took אחרית for *poſterity*: γενοιτο το σπερμα μου ως το σπερμα τουτων: but Vulg. *fiant noviſſima mea horum ſimilia*: and ſo equivalently all the other verſions. Moſt literally Gr. Ven. τελεσει τε τουσχατον μου ως αυτος. The meaning of the colon is well expreſſed by Dathe: *Mori cupio, ut probi illi! idem ſit meus, qui eorum exitus.*—Michaëlis labours to prove, that Balaam here expreſſes his hope of a bleſſed immortality§: "Sed hæc ſententia (ſays juſtly Roſen-"müller) hoc loco non apta videtur. Crediderim potius, illorum verborum ſenſum eſſe hunc: "*Iſraelitæ tanta fruentur felicitate, qualem ipſe mihi uſque ad mortem opto.* Quaſi dicat: *Utinam*

* In favour of this rendering, a paſſage of St. Luke has been referred to (chap. 3. ver. 5.), where the Greek words εξαι τα σκολια εις ευθειαν are by the Syr. tranſlator rendered, נהוא ערמא לשפיא; and certainly שפא in that dialect ſignifies *a plain*; and, as a verb, *to make plain*. † In his *Obſervationes ad Analogiam et Syntaxin Hebræorum*, p. 272. ‡ "Ex poteſtate Arabica verbi רבע, quod de *accumulata arena* dicitur; quodque reſpondet priori "verbo עפר. Sic ארבע eſt *multus, abundans*. Nec vero abs re Vulg. *ſirpis*. Nam רבע eſt etiam, Arabicè, *prolem* "*gignere in juventute*; affine verbo Hebraico *coire*."—Addere potuit idem רבע etiam ſignificare *cœtus hominum—familia—caterva*, &c. § *Syntagma Comment.* part. 1. p. 107.

"*mihi*

"*mihi contingat æque fortunatum mori!* . . . . . Innuit, totum populum Iſraeliticum per omnia "futura tempora feliciſſimum fore, neque ullum malum eſſe experturum."

Ver. 16. *The Lord met Balaam.* So the preſent text. But inſtead of יהוה the Sam. copy has מאלך יהוה, *the angel of the Lord.* Six Heb. MSS. and 4 more, at firſt, have אלהים inſtead of יהוה; and ſo Sep. and both Arabs.* Three MSS. have now, or had at firſt, both readings, יהוה אלהים. The two words have been ſo often interchanged by copyiſts, that it is impoſſible always to ſay, whether ſtood originally in the text.

Ver. 18. *Liſten to me.* האזינה עדי. So both texts; and a ſimilar conſtruction occurs in Job 32. 11. It muſt, however, be remarked, that the Septuagint conſidered עד as a noun, and not as a prepoſition. Their verſion is, ενωτισαι μαρτυς, *give ear, as a witneſs.* They ſeem not to have read the affix after עד, or to have neglected it. On their verſion Michaëlis formed his: "ſey aufmerkſahm, und ſey mein zeuge:" *be attentive, and be my witneſs.* The Syr. tranſlator alſo took עד for a noun, but in the objective caſe, and ſignifying not *a witneſs*, but *teſtimony*, צות לסהדותי; and I am not ſure but this is the true meaning. The other antient tranſlators who have rendered עדי by *my word* or *words* moſt probably conſidered עד as a noun. Thus, Saad. אנצת לקולי—Sam. v. אצית סעדותי†—and even the moſt literal Gr. Ven. has here ενωτισαι τα ρηματα μου.—On the whole, then, I am much inclined to think that עד, both here and in Job; and alſo in ſome other ſimilar caſes, ought to be rendered *teſtimony.*—Before I quit this verſe, I cannot help animadverting on an hypercriticiſm of Houbigant; who deems בנו צפור a ſoleciſm, although it be the reading of both texts, without any variety of lection in the MSS.—It is an elegant Arabiſm, or poetical licence; and gives here a peculiar emphaſis to the line.

Ver. 21. *I behold nothing harmful.* The preſent text has הביט, *he beholds:* and ſo read both Arabs, Perſ. and Gr. Ven. But Onk. Tharg. Syr. and the Sam. text and verſion read in the firſt perſon אביט; and this, I am perſuaded, is the true reading‡, followed by Dathe, *Non video malum inter Jacobitas*; better than Houbigant's *non videbo*, in the future.—For the reſt, און in this comma ſignifies neither *iniquity* nor *ſin*; but *harm, ill, trouble* of any kind. See the Arab אן.—In the ſecond comma, either an א has been dropt out of the text before ראה, or ראה is to be conſidered as a paſſive verb; as it was by Sep. and Jerom. See the note below.

Ver. 22. *Is to them as the ſtrength of the rhinoceros.* כתועפת ראם לו—Sep. ως δοξαι μονοκερωτος αυτω—Vulg. *cujus fortitudo ſimilis eſt rhinocerotis.*—So alſo Gr. Ven. ως κρατη μονοκερωτος αυτω—and ſo equivalently Saadias, and Arab. Erp. at leaſt if their רים ſignify the *rhinoceros.* But this has been doubted by modern critics; who think that the Arab ريم, as well as the Heb. ראם, denotes the *antelope.* Hence Michaëlis forms this verſion: *celeritas eſt illi ut gazellarum*§; on which let us hear Roſenmüller: "Sed equidem fateor, mihi hanc

* With whom, however, it is uſual to change יהוה into אללה. † The Latin tranſlator of the Sam. text was from this, no doubt, induced to render *auſculta teſtimonium meum.* ‡ What was read by Sep. and Vulg. it is hard to ſay: the former having ουκ εστι; the latter, *non eſt.* From their tranſlating paſſively the ראה of the next comma, ουδε οφθησεται—*nec videtur*—it might ſeem that they conſidered הביט alſo as a paſſive. § But in his German verſion: "ſein lauf iſt, wie der lauf des wilden ſtiers"—Hezel: "und ſtark iſt es (das volk) wie ein "wilder ochſe"—Dathe: *alacres ſunt, inſtar bubali.*

"imaginem

" imaginem non planè aptam videri. Hinc exiſtimaverim תועפת ראם idem eſſe quod Arab. " איפאד אלרים *elationem gazellarum*, qua locutione Arabes utuntur, quando indicare volunt, " gazellas *capite ſurſum elato* arrectiſque auribus adſtare, id quod hæc animalia præ alacritate " ſolent facere. Sic pulchra imagine fiſtitur populus Iſraeliticus, antea jacens et ſub Ægyp- " tiorum ſervitute oppreſſus, nunc vero in libertatem aſſertus et in feliciorem ſtatum evectus. " Hinc totum hunc verſum mallem vertere: *Deus hunc populum eduxit ex Ægypto: alacritas ei* " *eſt, ut gazellis.* Cæterum notandum, ex hac interpretatione vocem תועפת non eſſe referen- " dum ad radicem יעף, ſed, admiſsâ metathefi litterarum, ad Arab. يفع *aſcendit, altus fuit.*" This is certainly ſpecious, and even plauſible: but I am unwilling to think, that the Septuagint were here in the wrong.—Our common Engliſh verſion, which makes God have " the " ſtrength of an unicorn," is properly corrected by Delgado into " he is unto them as it " were like the ſtrength of an unicorn."—The other, he thinks, " ſavours of a profane ſpeech." —He has likewiſe well corrected ver. 23. which in our public verſion runs thus: " Surely " there is no enchantment againſt Jacob, nor is there any divination againſt Iſrael: according " to this time it ſhall be ſaid of Jacob and of Iſrael, What hath God wrought *?"—Our elder tranſlators more judiciouſly followed Sep. and Vulg. Ου γαρ εςι οιωνισμος εν Ιακωβ, ουδε μαντεια εν Ισραηλ—*Non eſt augurium in Jacob, nec divinatio in Iſrael:* both which verſions perfectly ſuit what follows: κατα καιρον ρηθησεται Ιακωβ και τω Ισραηλ, τι επιτελεσει ὁ Θεος—Vulg. *temporibus ſuis dicetur Jacob et Iſraeli quid operatus* (better *operaturus*) *ſit Deus.* The meaning is, that the Iſraelites have no need of omens, or divination: their God tells them occaſionally, and at proper times, what is to befall them†.—It is matter of wonder that Houbigant, Michaëlis, and even Dathe, ſhould adopt here the Syriac verſion, in oppoſition to all the others, ſave Saad.—The Gr. of Venice has well rendered the whole verſe: Ου γαρ εςι στοχασις εν Ιακοβ ουτε μαντις εν Ισραελ· κατα καιρον ρηθησεται τω Ιακοβ, τω Ισραελ τι εργασεται ὁ Θεος.

CHAP. XXIV.

Ver. 6. *LIKE vales planted with groves.* The preſent text has כנחלים נטיו: by Montanus rendered: *ſicut torrentes extenſa ſunt:* ſcil. *tabernacula Iſrael*—by our Engliſh tranſlators: " as " the valleys are they ſpread forth." The word נחל is ambiguous, ſignifying ſometimes *a torrent*, and ſometimes the *vale* through which it paſſes. In the former meaning it was taken by Onk. Tharg. Syr. and Gr. Ven.; in the latter, by Sep. Vulg. and, perhaps, both Arabs. This indeed ſeems to be the true meaning: for, what propriety would there be in likening the tents of Iſrael to *torrents?*—But what is the meaning of נטיו? It is commonly rendered *extended, ſpread forth*, &c. But the reading of Sam. text is נטעו‡; and ſo ſeem to have read Sep. and Jerom. The verſion of the former is, ὡσει ναπαι σκιαζουσαι—of the latter, *ut valles nemoroſæ.* This reading I have followed in my verſion.

* By Delgado corrected thus: " Surely there are no omens in Jacob, nor divinations in Iſrael: at all times it ſhall be " told unto Jacob and unto Iſrael what God is about to do." † " Iſraelitæ non ſunt dediti auguriis, nec opus iis " habent." Roſenmüller. ‡ But 8 Sam. and 1 Heb. MSS. have נמוי; and this I deem a more probable reading than נטיו. The metatheſis was eaſily made. Yet ſtill, with Houbigant, I prefer the textual reading of Sam.

Ib.

Ib. *Like lign-aloes.* Heb. כאהלים—Sep. ὡσει σκηναι—Vulg. *ut tabernacula*—and ſo equivalently Syr. Saad. and Gr. Ven. But the paralleliſm ſeems to require ſomething of the plant kind: and Onk. and Perſ. ſo underſtood it. But what *plant* is here deſignated? Onkelos keeps to a general term בסמיא, *aromatic plants.* The Perſic tranſlator is more particular: he makes it the *ſandal-wood.* Celſius* has made it probable, that it is the *lign-aloe*; by the Greeks called ξυλαλοη, and αγαλλοχον. See Explan. Note.

Ver. 7. The poet having before mentioned *water-ſtreams*, is naturally led to another metaphor; namely, the ſources from which they ſpring. I take דלי here to ſignify thoſe ſources, or ſource; and render it *an urn.* The Septuagint found the metaphor too harſh, and turned the phraſe another way: Εξελευσεται ανθρωπος εκ τȣ σπερματος αυτȣ.—In the next comma, I ſuſpect that the original reading was לעמים, not למים; a mark of which ſtill remains in the verſion of Sep. who have εθνων πολλων†.

Ib. *Their king ſhall be ſuperior to Agag:* ירם מאגג מלכו. But the Sam. reading is מגוג; and ſo Sep.: although, for the reſt, their text ſeems here to be corrupted. The Rom. ed. has ὑψωθησεται ἡ Γωγ‡ βασιλεια, to which the other editions add αυτου. But this mends not much the matter. It was not the kingdom of *Gog* (or Agag) which was to be exalted; but the king of Iſrael. Hence I ſuſpect that the original reading of Sep. was ὑψωθησεται η Γωγ βασιλεια αυτου: taking η, without an aſpirate, in the meaning of *quam, præ, ſuper*; which it is well known to have. Cyprian found in his Italic verſion, *exaltabitur, tanquàm Gog, regnum ejus*§.—Did the Sep. read מלכתו in the firſt comma as well as in the ſecond? or did they conſider מלך as equivalent to it?—However that be, the aſpirate ἡ is a corruption: although Jerom‖ ſeems to have ſo read; if indeed his copy of Sep. had any aſpirates.

Still it remains a queſtion, which is the true original reading, *Gog* or *Agag*? If the reading in Montfaucon aſcribed to Symmachus be really his, I ſhould conſider it as a ſtrong corroboration of the Sam. and Septuagint. His verſion is, ὑψωθησεται ὑπερ Γωγ βασιλευς αυτου.—Michaëlis imagined that, although *Gog* be not the genuine reading, it leads to it. He would read אגוג; and thinks it may have been the ſame with *Ogyges*, who brought a colony of Phœnicians into Bœotia, and reigned at Thebes. But this is vague conjecture. Nor is it poſſible at this day to decide the point with certainty. Yet, comparing the paſſage with ver. 20, I am inclined to think that the king of the Amalekites is here intended.

Ver. 17. *A ſtar traced from Jacob.* דרך כוכב מיעקוב. It is well known that *comets*, which were confounded with ſtars, were conſidered by the antients as prognoſtic of great events, particularly of the birth of great kings. See Le Clerc *in loc.*

Ib. *W'ill conſume the whiſkers of Moab.* The Hebrew is מחץ פאתי מואב. The Sam. printed text has פתי, but 2 MSS. read as Heb. And now for the meaning. Moſt of the antients, after Sep. give to פאתי the ſignification of *chiefs, princes*, or the like. They are ſuppoſed to

* Hierobot. p. 135, &c. † They took the preceding זרעו for a verb, from זרע *an arm*, and render κυριευσει in the ſing.; although מים be the antecedent: but they having before turned מים into ανθρωπος, it was neceſſary to continue the ſame mode of conſtruction. ‡ Compl. has Ψωχ. § Apud Sabatier. ‖ His verſion of Sep. is: *Et elevabitur Gog regnum ejus, et creſcet regnum illius.* But the Hebrew (adds he) I found to run thus: *Tolletur propterea* (the preſent Vulg. has *propter*) *Agag rex ejus, et auferretur regnum illius:* on which his comment is: "Eo quod regnum Iſrael in Saule, propter Agag regem Amaleck deſtructum ſit." Comment. in Ezechiel. c. 38. tom. iii. p. 968. ed. Ben. A ſtrange verſion, and a ſtranger comment!

have

have read פרחי. But I am perſuaded that פאתי is the genuine reading, and to be taken here in the ſame ſenſe as in Jeremiah 48. 45. where a very ſimilar paſſage occurs: and in both places, it is my belief, the word ſignifies *whiſkers*. Compare the Chald. and Syr. פאתא.—It is well known, that whiſkers, in the Eaſt, were and ſtill are deemed the greateſt ornament of the face; and to deſtroy or diſgrace them was conſidered as a moſt grievous affront. By giving this meaning to פאתי the paralleliſm is evident, and the figure highly poetical. The comet is to burn the whiſkers, the ſceptre is to break the crown of Moab: I ſay *crown*, becauſe I am perſuaded that the Samaritan קדקד is the genuine reading; and that both it and פאתי are governed by the ſame verb מחץ. I am even of opinion, that almoſt all the antient interpreters read קדקד, although they took it to be a verb: for, how out of קרקר*, the preſent Heb. reading, they could draw the idea of *ſmiting*, *domineering*, *ſubduing*, &c. I cannot poſſibly conceive; whereas all theſe meanings are found in the root קדד.

Ib. *The ſons of ſedition.* The Heb. is בני שת; in our common tranſlation rendered "the "children of Seth:" and ſo indeed moſt of the antient and modern verſions.—But what, pray, has *Seth*, or *Sheth*, to do with Moab? I am convinced that שת here means *ſedition*, *contempt*, *rebellion*, &c. See the root שאה, the Arab. שתאת, the Sam. שתשת, the Æthiopic SHAT, and the Chald. and Syr. שוט; and comp. Jerem. in the verſe already quoted; where he has שאן inſtead of שת.—The Moabites were ſubdued by David, and made tributaries to Iſrael: but after the death of Ahab they rebelled; but were reconquered by the joint efforts of Joram and Joſhaphat, aſſiſted by the king of Edom. Comp. 2 Sam. 8. 2. and 2 Kings 3. 4. to 24. But under the denomination of בני שת, *ſons of ſedition*, may be deſigned every *turbulent* neighbour. See Explan. Note.

Ver. 19. *A prince deſcending from Jacob.* The text has only וירד מיעקב, by Montanus rendered, *Et dominabitur de Jahacob:* by our Engliſh tranſlators, "Out of Jacob ſhall come he "that ſhall have dominion†." I believe the Septuagint have perfectly well rendered the comma: Και εξεγερθησεται εξ Ιακωβ—So Onk. ויחות חד מדבית יעקב: *And one ſhall ſpring from the houſe of Jacob*—and Syr. ונחת מן יעקוב: *Et deſcendet de Jacob.*—The Tharg. of Babylon has ſupplied the very word which I have uſed in my verſion: וירד ויקום שליט מדבית יעקב, *A prince ſhall deſcend, and ariſe from the houſe of Jacob.*—It is true that Jerom, Saadias, and the other tranſlators took ירד in the ſenſe of *dominari:* and Dathe has followed them: *Tum dominabitur aliquis ex Jacobitis.* In my verſion I have conjoined both acceptations.

With reſpect to the next comma, והאביד שריד מעיר, literally, *Et faciet-perdere reliquias ex civitate*; or, as Sep. και απολει σοζομενον εκ πολεως; the word עיר is to be taken collectively, of all the cities that were depopulated by the kings of Iſrael or Judah. Some think it relates to the cities of Moab only, which had not been unpeopled by David, or even by Joſhaphat; and

* Some moderns, indeed, have imagined that an appoſite meaning might be found in the Arab. קר, which in the 2d conjugation (as they call it) denotes *to tax*—Others derive it from the Chald. קרקר *glocitare*: "ut ſenſus ſit (ſays Al-"ting) *congregabit glocitando inſtar gallinæ filios Seth!!*"—Some derive it from קור *a wall:* hence קרקר is (e contrario) *to unwall!* Verſchuir would derive it from the Arab. קאר *fecare*; and this derivation is adopted by Dathe and Roſenmüller.—How forced is all this, every diſcerning reader will, I apprehend, readily perceive. But, what miſerable ſhifts have not been uſed, to ſave the integrity of the Maſoretic text? † They here overlooked their uſual Italic ſcrupuloſity; according to which, they ſhould have rendered: "Out of Jacob *ſhall come he*, that ſhall have dominion:"—and, even then, they would not have been completely literal.

would

would refer it to the reign of Alexander Jannæus; in whoſe time Joſephus ſays that a great number of cities were made dependent on Judæa*. But I cannot poſſibly ſubſcribe to this hypotheſis, which would naturally lead me to conſider the Pentateuch-hiſtory as a much later compilation, than I can believe it to be. I think the *oracle* refers to the cruel victories of David, recorded in 2 Sam. chap. 8. above quoted, and in 1 Chron. 18. 2.

As this and the two preceding verſes have been pretty generally ſuppoſed to relate to the MESSIAH, or CHRIST: I will here give my own opinion in the words of Dathe; with whom I perfectly agree: "Quanquam multi interpretes, antiquiores et recentiores, Judæi et Chriſti-"ani, hoc vaticinium de MESSIA explicârunt; tamen contextus tam parum favet huic opini-"oni, ut mirum videatur, tam multos in errore adeo manifeſto potuiſſe conſentire. Nam "præter *ſtellæ* et *ſceptri* nomina, ſub quibus regem intelligendum eſſe, dubio caret, nihil eſt "in toto loco, quod ad Meſſiam poſſit transferri: immo, omnia reliqua contrarium docent. "Dixerat Bileamus ver. 14. verbis minime obſcuris Balako, velle ſe, antequam in patriam "ſuam rediret, indicare, quid populus Iſraeliticus Moabitico, ſequentibus temporibus, ſit fac-"turus. Jam præmiſſa carmini ſuo prophetico præfatione, ver. 15. et 16. qua jam antea uſus "fuerat ver. 3. et 4. dicit, regem aliquando inſignem exiturum eſſe, qui Moabitas et Edomitas "ſit perditurus et deſtructurus, &c. At, enimvero, qui poſſunt hæc, niſi perquam coacte, ad "Meſſiæ regnum pacificum, et generi humano ſalutare, transferri†? Sed non opus eſt, ut "hoc pluribus refutemus; partim quoniam quivis, qui non præconcepta opinione impeditus ad "loci interpretationem accedit, ſenſum ejus facile poteſt inveſtigare; partim quoniam illius "explicationis errores ſatis demonſtrati ſunt et refutati ab interpretibus linguarum peritis, et a "piis illis hypotheſibus alienis."—He, in particular, refers his readers to Verſchuir‡ and Michaëlis§; to whom I likewiſe beg leave to refer mine. The places are quoted below.

Ver. 21. *The Kenites.* There is a *paronomaſia* in this and the next verſe, that cannot be preſerved in a tranſlation. *Ken* is *a neſt*, and the *Kenites* are *neſtlers:* as if we were to ſay: "Looking towards the *Neſtler*, he ſaid: Although thy *neſt* thou haſt fixed in a rock;" as eagles, ravens, and other birds of prey are wont to do.—We come now to a very difficult paſſage indeed.

Ver. 22. *And the cunning of Aſhur ſhall captive thee.* The preſent text is עד מה אשור תשבך, *donec Aſhur te captivet*; or, as our public verſion: "until Aſhur ſhall carry thee away cap-"tive."—But what ſenſe is there in this: "The Kenite ſhall be waſted, until Aſhur carry thee "away captive?" Beſides that, עד מה never ſignifies *until.* To ſay that מה is here redundant, is to give us words without validity: not to mention that the verb is feminine, and the nominative maſculine; for enallages of this kind are admitted. In ſhort, the whole ſentence,

* Κατα τουτον δε τον καιρον ηδη των Συρων, και Ιδουμαιων, και Φοινικων πολεις ειχον Ιουδαιοι: προς Θαλασσῃ μεν Στρατωνος πυργον, Απολλωνιαν, Ιοππην, Ιαμνειαν, Αζωτον, Γαζαν, Ανθηδονα, Ραφιαν, Ρινοκολουραν· εν δε τῃ μεσογειᾳ, κατα την Ιδουμαιαν, Αδωρα, και Μαρισσαν, και Σαμαρειαν, Καρμηλιον ορος και Ιταξυριον ορος, Σκυθοπολιν, Γαδαρα, Γαυλανιτιδα, Σελευκειαν Γαζαλα, ΜΩΑΒΙΤΙΔΑΣ Εσσεβων, Μηδαζα, Λεμβα, Ορωνας, Γελιθωνα, Ζαρα. κ. τ. λ. Antiq. l. xiii. c. 15. No. 4. p. 674. † The Jews, who expect a warlike and conquering Meſſiah, may with ſome degree of plauſibility apply the pretended prophecy to HIM: but how a Chriſtian ever could think of applying it to JESUS CHRIST, is, I confeſs, a wonderful thing. ‡ J. Henr. Verſchuir *Diſſertationes Philologico-exegeticæ.* Franqueræ, 1773. diſſert. 1. § Notes on his German verſion of the Bible. See alſo Roſenmüller *Scholia* in loc.

as it now ſtands, is, in my opinion, groſsly ungrammatical, and void of meaning. Read then ערמה in one word, as it was read by Sep.; but render not as they have done *. For the reſt, the terms קין, לבער, ערמה, are highly ſignificative, and give a beautiful ſtrain of poetical images. The Kenites, neſtling in rocks, were not to be ſubdued by open violence, but by ſtratagem; perhaps by ſetting fire to their holds, as the word בער ſeems to imply. The Scotch reformer John Knox uſed a ſimilar metaphor, when he deſtroyed the monaſteries: "Burn the "neſts (ſaid he), if ye wiſh the rooks not to build again."

Ver. 23. Of which the laſt member is thus written in the preſent Heb. text: אוי מי יחיה משמו אל: by Montanus rendered: *Væ! quis vivet a ponendo eum iſta?* He conſidered אל as a pronoun †, contrary to all the antients, who render it *God*, or ſome equivalent name.—Sep. Ω, ω! τις ζησεται 'οταν θη ταυτα ὁ Θεος?—Vulg. *Heu! quis victurus eſt, quando iſta faciet Deus?* And ſo, equivalently, Syr. both Arabs, and Gr. Ven. who moſt literally renders: Aι! τις ζησεται, απο του τιθεναι ἐ Θεον?—Our vulgar Engliſh verſion: "Alas! who ſhall live, when "God doeth this?" I cannot, however, believe this to be the meaning of the comma, although it has been adopted by moſt modern interpreters.—Some, indeed, have given a different turn to the ſentence; taking שם to be from the root שמם, *deſolari, vaſtare*; and render after Pagninus: "Who ſhall live, after God ſhall have deſtroyed *him*, or *it*?" So Le Clerc, and Houbigant, whoſe note is: "Sententia eſt: Væ ei qui ſuperſtes erit, poſtquam rempublicam ejus "Deus everterit. . . Agitur potiſſimum reſpublica Judæorum, cujus interitum Balaam ſequenti "verſu denuntiat."—Few critics, I think, will be pleaſed with this conceit. Whether my conceit will be more fortunate, I venture not to predict—but here it is.

In the firſt place, with Pagninus, Le Clerc, Michaëlis, I conſider שם not as a part of the verb שום *ponere*, but of שמם *deſolare*; and, as a noun, *deſolatio*, res *ſtupenda*. I next conſider שמו and אל as one word, שמואל ‡, *deſolatio Dei*; or *deſolatio maxima*, according to the oriental idiom. This שמואל, then, or שמיאל (for it is all one whether the word be written with a *vau* or a *jod*), I take to be the dreadful wind called *ſmum*, *ſumiel*, and *ſimooly*; which is looked upon by the Arabs and other eaſtern nations as the moſt peſtiferous and deſtructive that blows; and cauſing immediate death to thoſe whom it encounters unprepared. Lying down flat on the ground is deemed the beſt method of avoiding the danger: but the attack is ſometimes ſo ſudden, as to leave no time for precaution. The effects are ſometimes inſtantly fatal: the corpſe becomes livid, as if blighted by lightning. At other times it produces putrid fevers, which in a few hours prove mortal.—Such was the account of it which Dr. Ruſſell had from the Arabs of Aleppo.—At Aleppo, they, at preſent, write the word צמולי: but this, I apprehend, can be no great objection to my etymon. As early as the Greek tranſlation of the Pentateuch, the letters *ſamech*, *ſchin*, and *tſade* were in ſound confounded: and

* Και εαν γενηται τω Βεωρ νοσσια πανουργιας, Ασσυριοι αχμαλωτευσουσι σε. They conſidered בער as a proper name; whereas it is a part of the verb בער: and they put ערמה in regimen with קין; whereas itſelf is the nominative of חשב. Their verſion might be reformed thus: Αλλ' ὁμως νοσσια εϛαι εις καυσιν· πανουργια των Ασσυριων αιχμαλωτευσει σε. † He deſerted here his maſter Pagninus (whoſe verſion is, *Væ! quis vivet, poſtquam deſolaverit eum Deus?*) to follow the bulk of Rabbins, who take אל to be the ſame with אלה. I know not if he has been followed by any more recent interpreters, beſide Vatable and Malvenda. ‡ It is remarkable that many MSS. and ſome of the more antient editions read ſo; and one of De Roſſi's (265) not only reads ſo, but notes, in the margin, that ſuch is the reading in every correct copy, *in omni codice correcto*. See De Roſſi.

it

it is well-known that confuſion of ſound begets a new and different orthography; as might be ſhown by numerous examples. The *ſmum*, *ſumiel*, or *ſimooly* winds are moſt dreaded on the Baſſora ſide of the Deſert; which makes the application more forcible in the mouth of Balaam. Nothing, indeed, could be more appropriate to uſher in what he had to ſay of the *Chethites*, or *Greeks*, who, under Alexander, overthrew the Perſian empire, with a rapidity and impetuoſity equal to that of the *ſumiel*.—If this explication of a very difficult paſſage be rejected by my brother-critics, I ſhall patiently wait for a more plauſible one.

Ib. *Or protected from the hand of the Chethites.* The preſent text has וציים מיד כתים; commonly rendered "and ſhips from the coaſt of Chittim." It is generally allowed that this is one of the moſt obſcure paſſages of the whole chapter; and various interpretations have been given of it, which the reader may ſee in Poole, Calmet, or Roſenmüller. I ſhall content myſelf with attempting to eſtabliſh my own. In the firſt place, then, I conceive that the verſes have been ill divided, and that the laſt comma of ver. 23. belongs to ver. 24. Secondly, I conſider the meaning of that comma to be what I have rendered it: "who ſhall be preſerved from the ſumiel?" Thirdly, the true reading of the next comma, where we naturally expect a paralleliſm, I conceive to be יוצאים מיד כתים, which is ſtill the reading of 1 Sam. MS. and was that of Sep. and, probably, of Saadias: the former rendering και εξελευσεται (read with Copt. εξελευσονται) εκ χειρος (al. χειρων) Κιτιαιων—the latter, ואלדארמין מן פרצה קברס.—One might imagine that it ſhould be יוצא, or יצא, rather than יוצאים; to correſpond with יחיה in the foregoing comma: but that conſimilarity is not neceſſary: the numbers are frequently changed on ſuch occaſions; and the מי before יחיה (or, as Sam. reads, יהיה) is underſtood before יוצאים without any impropriety. The literal verſion would be: "Quis ſervabitur a "ſumiel? et qui exeuntes ex manu Chetheorum?" *Who ſhall eſcape from the hand of the Chethites?*—The meaning of the whole ſentence, then, is: that it ſhall be as difficult to eſcape the power of the Chethites, as it is to avoid the *ſumiel* or *ſmum*. This is, at leaſt, all the meaning I can make out of it.

CHAP. XXV.

Ver. 1. *THE people profaned themſelves:* ויחל העם. The word יחל is commonly rendered *began*, according to the Maſoretic punctuation: but, with Michaëlis and Delgado, I prefer the rendering of Sep. εβεβηλωθη. This profanation was, moſt probably, committed at the annual feaſt of Baal-pheor; at which it is not unlikely that the women, in honour of that god, expoſed themſelves to be vitiated by the firſt offerer. We learn from Herodotus*, that this was cuſtomary at Babylon; and the ſame rite is alluded to in the Epiſtle of Jeremiah†.

Ver. 3. *Some of them even wore the badges of Baal-pheor.* Heb. ויצמד ישראל לבעל־פעור; but Sam. has מבני before ישראל: and this is evidently a better reading. It was not all Iſrael that profaned themſelves on this occaſion; but only a part of them. For the reſt, the word צמד, which is commonly rendered *was joined*, expreſſes more than that. It means, that they aſſumed the marks or badges of the profane deity, whom the Moabites adored. See the Arab. צמד—Sep. ετελεσθη—Vulg. *initiatus eſt*—Not badly Gr. Ven. Και ξυνεπλακη Ισραελος τω σεβασματι του Πεωρος.

* Clio, c. 199. † Baruch, ch. 6. ver. 43.

Ver. 4. *Take all the chiefs of the people* with thee; *and let them slay*, &c. According to the preſent Hebrew text; or, rather, according to the faulty verſions that have been made from it, God is made to bid Moſes *take and hang all the chiefs of the people!* which is repugnant to the very next verſe. "If theſe words (ſays Kennicott) קח את כל ראשי העם והוקע אותם do not mean, that "Moſes was to hang up all the people, they muſt mean all thoſe who were *heads* or *judges* "of the people. But neither were theſe *judges* to be hanged up; becauſe, in the next verſe, "Moſes commanded thoſe very judges to ſlay ſuch of the people as had then been idolatrous. "The truth is, that ſome words have been omitted in the Sam. text, and ſome in the Heb. "and both together taken will complete the ſenſe, thus: *And the Lord ſaid unto Moſes*: SPEAK "*unto all the heads of the people*, AND LET THEM SLAY THE MEN THAT WERE JOINED UNTO "BAAL-PEOR; *and hang them up*," &c. So Kennicott, after Houbigant; whom I have followed in my verſion. Onkelos and both Thargums * underſtood, that Moſes was to take the chiefs of the people, as judges of the caſe, to try and put to death thoſe men, אותם, who had been guilty of profaning themſelves †.

Ver. 6. *Approached to his brethren, with a Midianite woman.* יקרב אל אחיו את המדינית. But the Septuagint ſeem to have read אל where את is, and את where אל is: as they render, Και ιδου ανθρωπος των υιων Ισραηλ, ελθων, παρεσηγαγε τον αδελφον αυτου ‡ προς την Μαδιανιτην· as if the tranſgreſſing Iſraelite had been led, by a procurer, to the tent of the Midianite woman: and this is in ſome ſort juſtified by ver. 8. as we ſhall preſently ſee. But the preſent Heb. text, which differs not here from Sam. will not readily admit ſuch a rendering: although it is well known that אל and את have been frequently interchanged by copyiſts; and ſeem ſometimes to have nearly the ſame meaning. Jerom renders thus: *Et ecce unus de filiis Iſrael intravit*, coram fratribus ſuis, *ad ſcortum Madianitidem*: which appears to favour the Septuagint verſion; but which may alſo have been formed, by way of paraphraſe, from the preſent Heb. The Syr. verſion is in the ſame predicament.

Ver. 8. *In the bedchamber.* Heb. אל קבתה—Sam. על קבתה—by Sep. rendered δια της μητρας αυτης—Vulg. *in locis genitalibus*—Onk. למעדא—and ſo equivalently all the verſions down to Gr. Ven. which hath προς τη κυστει ταυτης—and ſimilarly all the modern tranſlations, even Houbigant, Dathe, Michaëlis §, Schulz, Roſenmüller, &c.—Yet I am fully perſuaded that this is not the meaning; whether we read אל קבתה or על קבתה. I believe, with Delgado, that קבת here is to be taken in the ſame ſenſe as קבה in the former comma; and means the *alcove* ‖, or *receſs* in the tent, where the crime was committed. Delgado's remark is worthy of obſervation: "*Kobathah* muſt mean her *tent*, not her *belly*. It is true, that קבה *kebah* means *the ſtomach*: "but then, to expreſs *her ſtomach*, it ſhould be *kebathah*. Beſides, it ought to be expreſſed

* The Bab. Tharg. paraphraſes thus: "The Lord ſaid to Moſes: Take all the chiefs of the people, and appoint "them judges, and let them give judgment againſt thoſe who are to be ſlain, &c." And ſo equivalently Jeruſ.

† I find the following explication in Secker's MS.: "Take the magiſtrates to attend and aſſiſt thee, and hang the "offenders. לקח is uſed in an honourable ſenſe ch. 27. 10, 22."

‡ The word אותי, like אבי, may be in the ſing. or plur. They conſidered it as a ſingular; and ſo it was taken by Gr. Ven.

§ He leaves, indeed, the word untranſlated; becauſe, as he tells us in his note, German delicacy would not allow him to name its equivalent. "Was "hier ſtehet, nemblich der ort, wo die eine perſon verwundet, war, läſt ſich im Deutſcher, nach dem wohlſtand unſerer "ſprache, nicht nennen."

‖ This, indeed, is the ſame word, with an Arab. prefix. In Spaniſh, *al-coba*; and ſometimes *al-cova*.

"with

"with the pronoun poſſeſſive plural, *into their belly*; as by that tranſlation it muſt be ſuppoſed "that he killed them in the fact."—Houbigant, indeed, obviates this objection by rendering: "Ambos perfodit, mulierem autem ipſis in genitalibus:" but is this a warrantable verſion?—I think, not. I have before remarked, that קבתה with the affix ſeems to favour the Septuagint verſion: and indeed it is more likely that the Iſraelite would go to the *cuba* of the Midianite woman, than that ſhe (who was the daughter of a chief) would come to his. I am not even ſure, but that the *cuba* here mentioned was not a common tent, but one of thoſe ſacred receſſes in which the young women proſtituted themſelves for religion's ſake. For, alas!

Tantum relligio potuit ſuadere malorum!

At any rate, the *cuba* might be denominated *hers*, becauſe it was peculiarly appropriated to cohabitation with her. It was, *pro tempore*, her *gynacæum*.

Ver. 12. *Tell him, therefore.* The text has only לכן אמר, *Therefore ſay*—Sep. δυτως ειπον—Vulg. *idcirco loquere ad eum*—But the Syr. tranſlator either read אמרתי, or conſidered אמר as the firſt perſon ſing. of the future, converted into a preterite, or rather preſent, by the exigency of the meaning: and, indeed, this may be the ſenſe of the comma: "Therefore I ſay," &c.

If the curious reader wiſh to know what a fine *Greek* ſtory Joſephus makes of the ſubject of this chapter, he may turn to Antiq. l. iv. c. 6. No. 6. et ſeq. p. 218—223. Livy's *Rape of the Sabines* is nothing to it.

CHAP. XXVI.

Ver. 3 and 4. THAT a part of both theſe verſes is corrupted, no one at preſent doubts. They run thus: וידבר משה ואלעזר הכהן אותם בערבות מואב על ירדן ירחו לאמר מבן עשרים שנה ומעלה כאשר צוה יהוה את משה ובני ישראל היצאים מארץ מצרים: in our public verſion rendered: "And Moſes, and Eleazar the prieſt, ſpake with them, in the plains of Moab by Jordan "*near* Jericho, ſaying: *Take the ſum of the people* from twenty years old and upward, as the "Lord commanded Moſes and the children of Iſrael, which went forth out of the land of "Egypt."—Where note, that for the words in Italic there is nothing in the original; and that, according to this tranſlation, the Lord's order to number the people was given not only to Moſes and Eleazar, but to all the children of Iſrael who had come out of Egypt: which is contradictory to ver. 1.—In truth, the whole paſſage is in its preſent form an unintelligible farrago; which no commentator can clear, without correcting the text. Let us ſee what has been done toward that end. From the antient tranſlators little help is to be derived; both becauſe they all ſeem to have had vitiated copies of the original before them; and becauſe thoſe, who tranſlate not literally, gueſs at ſome general conſiſtent meaning. The moſt plauſible are the verſions of Vulg. and Syr. The former of theſe has: *Locuti ſunt itaque Moſes et Eleazar ſacerdos, in campeſtribus Moab, ſuper Jordanem contra Jericho, ad eos qui erant a viginti annis et ſupra, ſicut Dominus imperaverat; quorum iſte eſt numerus.* There is nothing in all this that is not conſonant with the context: but it is not a tranſlation of the preſent Hebrew.—The Syriac verſion is to this purport: "So Moſes and Eleazar the prieſt ſpoke with them in "the

"the plains of Moab, which are by the Jordan of Jericho: and Moſes numbered them from "twenty years, upward, as the Lord had given in command to Moſes." This verſion is alſo conſiſtent; but, ſtill, it is not conform to the original.—The other verſions are more literal, but for that reaſon unintelligible.

Have our modern interpreters better ſucceeded? Houbigant would make two ſupplements; one after לאמר, thus: שאו את ראש, *take up the ſum*; the other after ומעלה, thus: ויעשו, *and they did ſo*.—"Or, if ויעשו be not added (ſays he), לאמר muſt be expunged; and וישאו את "ראשיהם, *and they took up the ſum of them*, put in its ſtead."

Michaëlis would, with Syr. ſupply ויספר after ירחו: although in his German verſion* he has not followed that emendation.

Dathe's verſion is: "Moſes igitur et Eleaſar ſacerdos hoc eis promulgârunt in campeſtribus "Moabiticis juxta Jordanem e regione Hierichuntis: *atque numerum inierunt* eorum qui annum "viceſimum exceſſerant, quemadmodum Jova Moſi præceperat et Iſraelitis, cum ex Ægypto "eſſent egreſſi." He omits (rightly, I think) the word לאמר, and repeats, with Houbigant, וישאו את ראש; but doubts whether the laſt part of ver. 4. ſhould be connected with what precedes, or with what follows. I wonder he had any doubt on this head: but the Maſoretic diviſion, it appears, had ſome weight with him on this occaſion.

Roſenmüller, who heſitates between Dathe and Houbigant, adds: "Quidquid ſtatuas, hoc "ſaltem certum eſt, locum hunc eſſe adfectum, qui opem criticam adhuc expectat."—Whether this expectation will be anſwered by what I am going to ſay, it would be preſumption in me to affirm: but I am inclined to believe that my correction and explication of the text are the moſt plauſible that have yet been made. Firſt of all, I throw out לאמר, as evidently an intruder, although a very early one. It was, probably, introduced by ſome ignorant copyiſt, who underſtood not the meaning of דבר, and thought it muſt be followed by a לאמר, as in ver. 1. 2dly, I think דבר here does not ſignify *to ſpeak*, but *to count, ſum up, tell over*; which meaning it ſtill plainly retains in Arabic; and there are evident traces of it in Chald. and Syr.: ſee the Arab. דבר, and the various meanings of the Chald. and Syr. דבר in Caſtell. It may be worthy of remark, that the phraſe here is not ידבר אליהם, but ידבר אותם. I know that the particle אות, or את, has ſometimes after the verb דבר the ſame meaning as אל; but ſtill this is not the common form; and the other much more common one could not have been uſed here, in the ſuppoſition that the meaning of ידבר is ſuch as I have given to it.—*Id viderint acutiores.*

Ver. 10, 11. It is the remark of Secker (MS. Notes), that the text here ſeems to contradict chap. 16. ver. 27 and 32. And Whiſton, before him, had juſtly obſerved, that "we have in "the book of Numbers a very particular account of the deſtruction of the ſeditious Reuben-"ites Dathan, Abiram, and their partners; with Korah and his two hundred and fifty Levites: "of the Reubenites, *by the earth ſwallowing them up*; of the Levites, *by fire:* but what Korah "himſelf died of is not directly told us in our preſent Heb. and Greek Bibles. [He might have "added all the other verſions.] It rather ſeems by them, that he was *ſwallowed up*, than that

* "Dis machte Moſe und der prieſter Eleaſar in den Moabitiſchen gefilden am Jordan Jericho gegen über bekannt, "und ſagten: ihr ſolt von zwanzig iahren an und darüber gezählt werden, wie Jehova ſchon ehedem Moſe und den "Iſraeliten nach dem auſzuge aus Ægypten befohlen hat." An odd tranſlation, it muſt be confeſſed.

"he

" he was *burnt*, contrary to the reaſon of the thing itſelf; which would rather require, that " Korah, the head of the Levites that burned incenſe, ſhould periſh with thoſe who burned " incenſe with him; as Dathan and Abiram were ſwallowed up with the other Reubenites. " Now, here we have both the Sam. Pentateuch and Joſephus, as authentic witneſſes that the " original Hebrew aſſerted, that Korah was *burnt with his Levites:* and in effect the Pſalmiſt's " teſtimony alſo*, who mentions only Dathan and Abiram as *ſwallowed up*, and not burnt. " Alſo we have the teſtimony of the *Apoſtolical Conſtitutions* †; and in effect of Clement of " Rome, of Ignatius and Euſebius, that the Septuagint verſion originally gave the ſame account. " So that here we have a clear inſtance of the alteration of both the Heb. and Gr. copies of " the Old Teſtament, ſince the firſt century ‡." Clear as this inſtance appeared to Whiſton, poſterior critics, even Houbigant §, Michaëlis, Dathe, Roſenmüller, Hezel, &c. ſaw it not in that light. They make Korah die with Dathan and Abiram. But whoever has carefully compared verſes 6, 16, and 19, of chap. 16. with the preſent paſſage, muſt, I think, be of Whiſton's opinion; and be thankful that the Samaritan text has preſerved the true reading.—It is but fair, however, to ſtate one objection that may be made from chap. 16. ver. 24. where the Lord bids Moſes deſire the people to " depart from about the abode, משכן, of KORAH, Dathan and " Abiram." Here the abode of Korah is mentioned, as to be ſwallowed up, as well as the abodes, or tents, of Dathan and Abiram: and in ver. 27. the people " departed, on every ſide, " from about the abodes of KORAH, Dathan and Abiram." How would I reconcile this? I would either ſay, that the word *Korah* is in both places an interpolation, which I am not a little inclined to do; or that the tent of Korah, although it contained not himſelf, contained his ſeditious retainers; and was on that account ingulphed in the fate of the other rebels. It is not ſaid that Korah was in his tent; or ſtood at the door of his tent, as did Dathan and Abiram: ver. 28. Nor is it ſaid in ver. 12. that Moſes ſent for Korah; but only for Dathan and Abiram: nor in ver. 25. that Moſes went to Korah; but only to Dathan and Abiram: whereas, on the other hand, it is clear from ver. 16, 17. and 19. that Korah was preſent at the head of the Levites who offered incenſe at the door of the convention-tent; and was conſequently among thoſe whom fire devoured; and not among thoſe whom the earth ſwallowed up. How his *ſons* eſcaped, as is ſaid chap. 26. ver. 11. or where they were when the calamity happened, the Hiſtorian gives us leave to conjecture the beſt we can. They moſt probably had, againſt their father, ſided with Aaron; and had, previouſly to the opening of the earth, left their father's tent, if it was among thoſe that were ſwallowed up:—which, as I have already hinted, may admit a doubt.—I have only to add, that a ſmall tranſpoſition in the preſent Heb. text will make it correſpond with the Sam. copy; although הארץ be not repeated in ver. 10.

* Pſ. 106. 17. † Which Whiſton believed to be canonical ſcripture. ‡ See Eſſay on the true Text of the Old Teſtament, p. 64. or Kennicott's Rem. p. 70. § " Rectè *devoravitque eos et Core.* Sed Samaritani " iterant הארץ *terra*, ubi nunc legitur ואת קרח, quæ ultima verba rejiciunt poſt האש, tanquam diceret Moſes: *cum* " *devoraret ignis Core et ducentos qüinquaginta.* Malè id quidem. Neque enim Core igne abſumptus fuit, ſed terræ " hiatu dehiſcentis, et ante periit Core, quam igne abſumerentur cæteri ducenti quinquaginta." This was to have been proved.

I ſub-

I ſubjoin the comparative numbers of this and a prior muſter in Num. 1.

Tribes.	*Prior Muſter.*	*Preſent Muſter.*		
REUBEN . . .	46500 . .	43730 . .	Diminiſhed . .	2770
SIMEON . . .	59300 . .	22200 . .	Diminiſhed . .	37100
GAD	45650 . .	40500 . .	Diminiſhed . .	5150
JUDAH	74600 . .	76500 . .	Increaſed . .	1900
ISSACHAR . . .	54400 . .	64300 . .	Increaſed . .	9900
ZEBULON . . .	57400 . .	60500 . .	Increaſed . .	3100
EPHRAIM . . .	40500 . .	32500 . .	Diminiſhed . .	8000
MANASSEH . .	32200 . .	52700 . .	Increaſed . .	20500
BENJAMIN . .	35400 . .	45600 . .	Increaſed . .	10200
DAN	62700 . .	64400 . .	Increaſed . .	1700
ASHER . . .	41500 . .	53400 . .	Increaſed . .	11900
NAPHTHALI . .	53400 . .	45400 . .	Diminiſhed . .	8000
Total .	603550 . .	601730 . .	Diminiſhed . .	1820

The LEVITES, now numbered, were 2300; by which it appears, that ſince their prior muſter chap. 3. 42. they had increaſed only 627.

Ver. 59. *Whom Atha bare to him in Ægypt.* With Michaëlis, I take אתה to be a proper name, the mother of Jochabed. Thoſe who follow the preſent Hebrew punctuation are obliged to ſupply ſomething; as our Engliſh tranſlators have done: "the daughter of Levi, whom *her* "*mother* bare to Levi in Egypt." Others ſupply *his wife* *. The Septuagint ſeem to have read אתם, referring it to the poſterity of Levi in the following verſe. The Latin Vulg.† Onk. Syr. Saad. took ילדה to be in the paſſive voice; and either read not אתה, or diſregarded it: or, perhaps, they conſidered it as a nominative. The other ant. verſions follow the preſent Heb.: as ſpecimens, take Gr. Ven. ἣν ετεκεν αυτῳ Λευι: and Arab. Erp. אלתי ולדתהא ללוי. Againſt the natural and eaſy reading of Michaëlis I can ſee only one objection; namely, that it makes Jochabed the immediate daughter of Levi, and conſequently the aunt of her huſband Amram. But if ſhe were born toward the end of Levi's life, ſhe might be as young as, or even younger than, Amram; and might be at the ſame time his aunt and his wife. We have ſeen aunts and uncles ſeveral years younger than their nephews and nieces.

CHAP. XXVII.

Ver. 3. *FOR his own ſin only did our father die.* The words *our father* are in the Sam. only, and may poſſibly be an interpolation: but the phraſe is ſo idiomatically pleonaſtic, that I can hardly not believe it a genuine reading. It ought not however to be concealed, that great

* So Dathe, *uxor ejus:* yet he allows that this is a harſh ellipſis: "Ellipſis nominis *uxoris* dura eſt, et integra formula "contra uſum loquendi in hujuſmodi genealogiis." † *Quæ nata eſt ei in Ægypto*; followed by Luther, Munſter, Caſtalio, Houbigant; and by our Coverdale and Bate.

critics

critics are of a different opinion; nay, who think that the words in queſtion are not even to be underſtood. They ſuppoſe, that it is not Zalaphahad who is here ſaid to have died in his own ſin; but Korah, who is mentioned immediately before. Among theſe critics is Roſenmüller. "Rectius, ſine dubio, verba כי בחטאו מת ad Korachum, ſubjectum proximè antecedens, refe-"runtur; ut ſenſus ſit: Pater noſter mortuus eſt in Deſerto, filiis non relictis; neque tamen "fuit inter eos qui contra Jehovam rebellarunt cum Koracho, qui ob peccatum ſuum mortuus "eſt." This is plauſible; and the text, I think, will abſolutely bear ſuch a meaning: but the *ſine dubio* is too ſtrong; and I am rather inclined to think with Dathe, that the ſin here mentioned is to be referred to Zalaphahad: "ſcilicet commune illud (peccatum) omnibus Iſraelitis, "qui, propter incredulitatem, intra 40 annos in Deſerto mortui ſunt."—If the Sam. lection be admitted, it totally excludes any other meaning.

Ver. 14. The addition which I have here inſerted from Sam. is at preſent placed in that copy after ver. 13. of chap. 20. I have thence transferred it hither, as to what I take to be its proper place. The different readings which occur in the Heb. and the verſions are to be found in P. P. Deut. 3. 23—28.

Ib. *O Lord, God.* The Heb. text in Deut. and the Sam. in both places have אדוני יהוה; but all the antient interpreters, ſave Gr. Ven. ſeem to have read יהוה אלהים; which is the reading of two of Kennicott's MSS.—Another MS. has only יהוה—another, both readings together, יהוה אלהים אדוני יהוה—and another, אדוני אלהים יהוה. In my verſion I have followed the reading of the antients.

Ver. 21. *By means of the urim.* במשפט האורים—Sep. *την κρισιν των δηλων*—and, what I did not expect, the Greek of Venice has a ſimilar rendering, *εν κρισει των φωτισμων*—And, indeed, almoſt all the other antient tranſlators ſeem to have conſidered אורים as an appellative, denoting either *illumination*, or *manifeſtation*, or *declaration*—Vulg. omits it altogether; having only *conſulet Dominum*—Tharg. and Perſ. retain the Heb. word; which, with our common verſion, I have alſo done. See Rem. on Exod. 28. 30.

CHAP. XXVIII.

Ver. 2. *MY fire-feeding oblations:* לחמי לאשי: by our tranſlators rendered, "my bread for "my ſacrifices made by fire." But לחם here means not *bread*; but the victims, or other offerings, that were thrown into the altar-fire to feed it.

CHAP. XXIX.

Ver. 1. SEE Levit. 23. 24. This expiation-faſt, of the 10th of Tiſri, (September 23d) is at Aleppo kept by the Jews with the greateſt punctuality. It is a faſt of twenty-four hours complete; and women with child, or ſick perſons, who are exempt on other occaſions, will hardly accept of a diſpenſation on this day. They call it in Arabic צום כיבור; by the Jews expreſſed צום כיפור. See Ruſſel's *Aleppo*.

CHAP. XXX.

Ver. 3. *WHILE ſhe is yet a girl:* i. e. under twelve years of age, according to the Rabbins: but I believe it was as long as ſhe remained unmarried, or at leaſt unbetrothed, in her father's houſe. It has been conſidered as a difficult thing to give a clear unambiguous explanation of this chapter. I flatter myſelf, that little obſcurity will be found in my tranſlation of it.

CHAP. XXXI.

Ver. 6. *THE holy inſtruments:* כלי הקדש—Sep. *τα σκευη τα ἁγια*—Vulg. *vaſa ſancta.* What theſe holy inſtruments were, we are not told. Le Clerc thinks that *the trumpets* only are meant. It is well known that the *connective* ו often means *that is*; or, as tranſlators ſometimes render it, *even.* Others, among whom our Spencer, imagine that the *holy inſtruments* here mentioned were the *urim* and *thumim.* Perhaps it was the *ark* and its appurtenances.

Ver. 7. *Slew every male.* According to the cruel and ſanguinary laws of war of antient times. The Greeks appear to have treated the Trojans in the ſame manner. They ſlew the males, and captived the females. See the *Troades* of Euripides, *paſſim.*

Ver. 8. *Kings of Midian.* They ſeem to have been petty princes, or emirs, vaſſals to the king of Midian.

Ver. 17 and 18. Who can read theſe two verſes, without ſhuddering? But who will dare to ſay, that ſuch an order could proceed from God? According to Le Clerc, and ſome other interpreters, Moſes was induced to give this ſanguinary order, leſt the male children grown up, and recollecting that they had been born free, might be troubleſome to the Hebrew republic, and attempt its overthrow.—A very fine reaſon for juſtifying ſuch a butchery! Great indeed muſt the carnage have been, when there ſtill remained, unſlain, 37500 virgins, for the ſervice and luſt of the Iſraelites. The *purification,* after this ſlaughter, was a fit concluſion of the tragedy: a religious Pagan ceremony. "It was cuſtomary (ſays the Scholiaſt on Sophocles*) "among the antients, for thoſe who had ſlain a man, or committed other ſlaughter, to waſh "his hands in water, by way of purification."—Thus, Æneas requeſts his father to carry the houſehold gods of the family, as it was not lawful for himſelf to touch them, being ſo recently polluted with blood:

Tu, genitor, cape ſacra manu patrioſque penates:
Me, bello e tanto digreſſum et cæde recenti,
Attrectare nefas; donec me flumine vivo
Abluero. Æn. ii. 717—720.

Ver. 49. *There is not miſſing of us a ſingle man.* לא נפקד ממנו איש—Benè Vulg. *ne unus quidem deſuit*—Sep. *ου διαπεφωνηκεν ἀπ' αὐτων ουδε ἑις*—Did they read מדם?—It may ſeem wonderful, that the Iſraelites loſt not a man on this occaſion: yet it is not the only inſtance of a ſimilar kind. The following note I tranſcribe from Roſenmüller: "Id multis non facilè creditu viſum

* Schol. in Ajacem Magiſt.

"eſt.

" eſt. Sed ſimilia exempla occurrunt in hiſtoria barbara. Sic apud Tacitum, l. xiii. c. 39. " Corbulo caſtellum quoddam Parthicum cepiſſe narratur, *nullo milite amiſſo*, trucidatis vero " omnibus, qui illud defenderent. Et apud Strabonem, l. xvi. p. 1128. deſcribitur prælium in " quo *mille* Arabes, et *duo* duntaxat Romani, occiſi ſunt. Accidebat *fortaſſe* quod Midianitæ " non bellicoſi erant, et ex inſidiis oppreſſi." There was no need of a *fortaſſe:* it is clear from what is reported of the Midianites in the book of Numbers, that they were an effeminate, unwarlike nation. If they had been a nation of ſoldiers, they would not have ſent for a ſoothſayer to curſe their enemies. The conqueſt of ſuch a people muſt have been eaſily obtained.

Ver. 50. *Bracelets, wriſtlets,* &c. I will not pretend to ſay that theſe Engliſh names are ſtrictly equivalent to the Hebrew words, which are אצעדה—צמיד—טבעת—עגיל—כומז—by Sep. rendered χλιδωνας—ψελλιον—δακτυλιον—περιδεξιον—εμπλοκιον*—by Vulg. *periſcelides—armillas—annulos—dextralia—muræenulas.*—After comparing the verſions, and tracing the words throughout the various dialects, I have given to each that meaning, which ſeemed to me the moſt probable. Our common verſion has *chains—bracelets—rings—ear-rings—tablets*—Dathe: *armillas—torques—annulos—inaures—globulos*—Michaëlis: " armbänder—händbander—ringe—" ohrengehänge—güldene kugeln."

CHAP. XXXII.

Ver. 1. *PLACES fit for cattle.* The whole region between Gilead and the Euphrates was a ſort of common, exceedingly fit for paſturage. No wonder then that the Reubenites and Gadites, who had a very great number of cattle, particularly of ſheep and goats, deſired to fix their reſidence in that land.

Ver. 3. *Beon.* We meet with this name in all the following forms: בעל־בעון—בעון—בית־בעל־בעון—and בית־מעון. The *mem* and *beth* have been often interchanged in Hebrew names; from their being both labial letters.

Ver. 12. *The Kenezite:* הקנזי. In the genealogy from Judah, 1 Chron. 4. 13. we are told that *Kenaz* was the father of *Othniel* and *Zeraiah*; but it is nowhere ſaid whoſe ſon he was himſelf. In Joſh. 15. 17. *Othniel* is called the *ſon of Kenaz* and the *brother of Chaleb:* and in Judges 1. 13. he is called *Chaleb's younger brother:* and in the paſſage now before us *Chaleb* is indeed called *the Kenezite*; but his father is both here and elſewhere called *Jephuneh.* In 1 Chron. 4. 15. Kenaz is ſaid to be the ſon of Elah, and grandſon of Jephuneh. Theſe are all the Kenazes belonging to the tribe of Judah. We read of another *Kenaz* in Gen. 36. 11. but he was the ſon of Eliphaz, a deſcendant from Eſau.—In this obſcurity we muſt grope our way: I am however led to think, that *the Kenezite* is an epithet applied to *Jephuneh*; whoſe name denotes celebrity: *perclarus—conſpicuus—reſpectable.* The word קנז exiſts not in Hebrew as an appellative noun or verb; but in Arab. it denotes an *innocent, innoxious* man: which was probably the character of Jephuneh; and hence his children were called the ſons of *the Kenezite*; or ſimply Kenezites; as the poſterity of *Rechab*, the father of Jonadab, were denominated the *Rechabites.*—This is the moſt which I can make of the matter.

* Perhaps the reader will be pleaſed to ſee how they are rendered by Gr. Ven. ψελλιον—χειριδα—δακτυλους—ελλοτιον—μητροποριην. See, on the meaning of this laſt term, the Rem. on Exod. 35. 22. p. 302.

Ver. 23. I have ſaid in Explan. Note, that the Septuagint ſeem to have had before them a different reading. Their verſion is: γνωσεσθε την αμαρτιαν υμων, οταν υμας καταλαβη τα κακα.

Ver. 31.* *What the Lord hath ordained:* את אשר דבר יהוה—But two MSS. have את כל אשר, *whatſoever*—and Vulg. Syr. one of De Roſſi's Chald. MSS. and even Gr. Ven. (καθοτιπερ) ſeem to have read כאשר without את. With theſe De Roſſi claſſes Sep. but this is a miſtake: their reading is ὁσα, not ὁπως. The meaning is all the ſame, in either of the readings.

Ver. 38. *Baal-meon* (*its name being changed*). The name of *Baal-meon* ſeems to have been changed on account of *Baal's* being the common name of the principal divinity worſhipped in thoſe countries. It was probably changed into *Been*, as before remarked. Yet the former name, and indeed moſt other names changed by them, ſtill held their ground: as is uſual in other countries; where the more antient names of mountains, rivers, and cities are hard to be diſplaced. Some modern critics think that מסבת שם (*its name being changed*) is an interpolation. Others imagine, that it relates not only to Baal-meon, but to all the other cities here mentioned: that is, that the names of them all were changed by the Iſraelites. This is not warranted by the text.

CHAP. XXXIII.

WE are not to imagine, that all the ſtations and encampments of the Iſraelites, during forty years, are here particularly enumerated. Thoſe places ſeem only to be mentioned where they reſided ſome conſiderable time; whence, as from a centre, they made occaſional excurſions, for the ſake of feeding their flocks, and other domeſtic avocations†. Compare the 13th, 14th, 15th and 16th chapters of Exodus.

Ver. 33. *Mount Gadgada.* The preſent Heb. has חר הגדגד: by our tranſlators rendered "Hor-hagidad." But the Sam. text and verſion, with 7 Heb. MSS. and at firſt 4 more‡, have הר inſtead of חר; and ſo read Sep. εις το ορος Γαδγαδ—So alſo Vulg. *in montem Gadgad.* The others read חר; if Gr. Ven. be not an exception: his rendering is εν ωρῳ Γαδεγαδου. I have, with Houbigant, adopted the other reading; and, moreover, read with Sam. הגדגדה, inſtead of הגדגד.

CHAP. XXXV.

Ver. 5. ALTHOUGH I have endeavoured to explain this verſe by means of a diagram, I will not ſay that I am certain of being altogether right. Houbigant has given a very different plan; and Delgado, one that differs from both: which the curious reader may compare with mine, and give the preference to that which beſt pleaſes him. I find, Michaëlis's general dimenſions are the ſame with mine.

Ver. 12. *From the blood-avenger.* מגאל. Volumes have been written on this ſingle word גאל or גואל, GOEL: yet its preciſe meaning has not yet been well aſcertained. By Sep. it is rendered αγχιςευων το αἱμα§—by Vulg. *cognatus occiſi.*—Michaëlis thinks that the original meaning of

* In Var. Read. wrongly marked 32. † Take as an inſtance what is related in ver. 36. that "from Ebrona "they marched to Ezion-gaber:"—by far too great a diſtance for one day's march. To try to trace thoſe marches and ſtations, then, by the modern marches of the caravans, would be labour in vain. ‡ One of De Roſſi's Chald. MSS. has the ſame reading: and Tharg. has an equivalent one. § They probably read מגאל הדם, as it is written in ver. 21.

of the word גאל is *to contaminate*; and that גואל ſignifies one *contaminated with blood*; a *blood-ſtained* perſon. I think quite the contrary; namely, that *to contaminate* is only a ſecondary meaning of גאל.—According to others, the proper meaning of גאל is *obire, peragrare*; *to live as a Bedouin*; and thence contract their habits—one of which was, to *avenge* the blood of a near relation. But this is a round about etymon indeed, and even leſs admiſſible than that of Michaëlis. I am of opinion that the primitive meaning of גאל is *to protect*. See the Arab. גאל and the Syr. גל under the root גול. Thence all the other ſignifications are readily derived. Saadias ſeems to have underſtood the word גואל in this ſenſe; as he renders מן אלולי.

From Pauſanias and from Homer we learn, that, among the Greeks, the next relations of the murdered had a right to claim revenge: ſo that it was not an uſage peculiar to the Jews, Arabs, and other eaſtern nations. The cuſtom was, no doubt, eſtabliſhed long before Moſes; and was probably coeval with man in ſociety. It was wiſe, however, in Moſes to abate its ferocity, as much as poſſible, by giving temporary aſylums to the guilty perſon, from the immediate purſuit and warm reſentment of the *avenger of blood*, or גואל־הדם.

Ver. 25. *Who hath been anointed with the holy oil.* Delgado blames our tranſlator for rendering משח paſſively; and makes *the congregation* העדה its antecedent. But beſide that עדה is feminine, it was not certainly the *congregation* that anointed the high-prieſt. The verb משח is an *impersonal*, as ירצה is in ver. 30; and as many other verbs throughout the Hebrew writings. Our tranſlators then did well to render paſſively, after almoſt all the antients; as our language rarely admits impersonal verbs. The French would ſay: *qu'on avoit oint*. The Septuagint ſeem to have read משחו, as they render *ὁν εχρισαν αυτον*: but perhaps they only thus hellenized the Hebr. impersonal; as they do on ſome other occaſions. The Sam. copies have, in this verſe, המכה inſtead of הרצח; but all the antients ſeem to have read as Heb. The diſtinction in Sep. is obvious. They render מכה by *παταξας*, but רצח by *φονευσαντα*.

Ver. 31. *For a man-ſlayer who hath been found guilty of murder, ye ſhall accept of no atonement.* Atonement here is equivalent to *ranſom*; and the Hebrew Legiſlator very juſtly reprobates, and forbids, ſo unworthy a traffic: which, moſt probably, was not uncommon before his days.

The law of Mohammed, with reſpect to avenging blood, is this: "If any one be unjuſtly "ſmitten, we give to his heir the right of demanding ſatisfaction: but he muſt not put the murderer "to death in a *cruel* manner; nor avenge the blood of his relation upon any other perſon than "the murderer*." All the Arabs, however, mind not this laſt caution. If they cannot find the murderer himſelf, they make repriſals on his next of kin, or perhaps on the chief of his family. In ſome places, a ranſom is accepted: but the Arabs of Theman deem it a baſe thing in the *Goel*, or blood-avenger, to remit the murder of a relation for money. See Niebuhr's Deſcription of Arabia, vol. i. p. 28—31. of the French edition.

Ver. 32. I have inſerted the word *high* before *prieſt*, on the authority of all the Sam. copies, Sep. Syr. Vulg. and one of Kennicott's MSS. which has הכהן הגדול. I have joined Vulg. to the other verſions, becauſe, although he has not *ſacerdos magnus*, he has its equivalent *pontifex*.

ver. 21. and as it was at firſt written here in the margin of one MS. and appears to have been effaced in other two. It ſeems alſo to have been read by Onk. and Syr. the former of whom has מגאל דמא, the latter מן תבע עירתא דדמא.

* Koran. ſur. ii. 173.

CHAP.

CHAP. XXXVI.

Ver. 3, 4. DELGADO is ſurpriſed that our Engliſh tranſlators ſhould add the word *received* in theſe two verſes, without putting it in Italics. It is certainly contrary to their uſual ſcrupuloſity: but ſurely they were not much to blame for this. Perhaps, they would have done better to follow Sep. ὁις αν γενωνται γυναικες. At any rate, Delgado had no reaſon to complain of them, ſince in their marginal reading they have literally followed the Heb. *unto whom they ſhall be.*—I have ſaid in my Explan. Note, that moſt of the verſions of ver. 4. are hardly intelligible. That of our common tranſlation is: "And when the jubile of the children of Iſrael "ſhall be, then ſhall their inheritance be put into the inheritance of the tribe whereunto they "are received: ſo ſhall their inheritance be taken away from the inheritance of the tribe of our "fathers." The meaning of which, if it have any, muſt be, that the inheritance of Zalaphahad's daughters would be "put to the inheritance" of ſome other tribe, only when the jubilee-year ſhould arrive: which certainly cannot be the meaning of the text.—Houbigant underſtood his text, and has not badly rendered it: "Et, jubilæo filiis Iſrael adveniente, *manebit* ipſarum "hæreditas adjuncta ad eam tribum, ad quam ſe contulerint." His verſion would have been clearer thus: "Et, vel etiam jubilæo filiis Iſrael," &c. I wonder that Michaëlis and Dathe did not attend to this. It was attended to by Roſenmüller, whoſe ſcholium is: "Senſus eſt: "etiamſi futurus eſt annus jubilæus, nihilominus tamen manebit hæreditas illarum penes alios." —Of the ant. verſions, the Septuagint at leaſt, I think, admits this meaning.

Ver. 11. The order of the names of Zalaphahad's daughters is in Sep. Vat. thus: Θερσα, Εγλα, Μελχα, Νοουα, Μαλαα. And ſo the Coptic verſion. But the other editions and the Glaſg. MS. follow the order of Heb.

Ib. *Paternal couſins.* לבני דדיהן—Sep. τοις ανεψιοις αυτων—Vulg. *filiis patrui ſui.*—Dathe, *patruelibus ſuis.*

DEUTERONOMY. CHAP. I.

Ver. 1. *ON the other ſide of the Jordan*—בעבר הירדן—Sep. περαν του Ιορδανου—Vulg. *trans Jordanem*—Onk. בעברא דירדנא—and ſo equivalently the other verſions*, even Gr. Ven. which has εν τω περαν του Ιορδενου. So alſo our firſt tranſlators Coverdale, Matthew, Cranmer, Biſhops. But our laſt tranſlators, following the Genevans, changed the "other ſide" into "this ſide:" and ſo moſt moderns; fearing that, if the word were rendered otherwiſe, it would be conſidered as a proof that Moſes was not the writer of this narrative. Is this an honourable way to obviate objections? In my opinion, the word בעבר, here, is one ſtrong proof that the writer lived on the weſt ſide of the Jordan, and conſequently could not be Moſes. But

* Thoſe who tranſlated the Syr. and Tharg. in Pol. make them both ſay "on this ſide," *cis* or *citra:* but the original words are בעברא and בעיברא; which why they ſhould be rendered *on this ſide*, I ſhould like to ſee ſome good reaſon adduced.

more

more of this in its proper place. Meanwhile, I content myſelf with ſaying, that I believe a ſingle fair example cannot be produced, where עבר or בעבר ſignifies *on this ſide*.

Ib. *Over againſt Suph.* Not, as in our common verſion, "the Red *Sea*;" from which the plains of Moab were at too great a diſtance, to be ſaid to be "over againſt it." I take the סוף here to be the ſame with the צוף of 1 Sam. 9. 6. over againſt which, but on the other ſide of the river, Moſes delivered to his Iſraelites the *Deuteronomy*, or a rehearſal of his preceding laws.—Hence the Jews call it משנה התורה, or REPETITION OF THE LAW*.

Ver. 3. *Rehearſed to the children of Iſrael.* We are not to ſuppoſe that the words of Moſes were actually addreſſed to all the Iſraelites. They were immediately addreſſed only to the chiefs of the people, to the ſenate or elders: but they are ſaid to be ſpoken to all the people, becauſe the injunctions concerned them all.—The whole addreſs of Moſes is one of the moſt beautiful that ever were uttered by human lips. The wiſdom, the modeſty, the perſuaſive eloquence and the paternal ſolicitude of the legiſlator are conſpicuous throughout, and capable of touching the moſt obdurate hearts. Yet, how little regarded his precepts were in after-times, the ſeries of Hebrew hiſtory will teach us.

Ver. 5. *Was Moſes pleaſed.* הואיל משה. The antients ſeem to have read החל, *he began*. So Sep. ἠξατο—Vulg. *cæpit*—Onk. Tharg. and Syr. שרי—Saad. אמעו—But Arab. Erp. Perſ. and Gr. Ven. have much better rendered the original by אשתרצי—מראדיכרד—βεβουληται—all terms perfectly equivalent to the Heb. הואיל. Delgado, then, did well to correct our public verſion here, by changing *began* into *was willing*; although this latter term is not the moſt proper one. —Better Houbigant, *viſum fuit Moyſi*.

Ver. 18. *At the ſame time I inſtructed* YOU. I have ſaid in Explan. Note, that I ſuſpected the true reading to be THEM; namely, the *Judges*. But all the copies have either אלכם or אליכם: and all the verſions down to Gr. Ven. render in the ſecond perſon. I have alſo ſaid, that perhaps the inſtructions here alluded to may be the Decalogue: and ſo, I find, the Thargumiſts underſtood it: עשרא פתגמיא.

Ver. 32. *And are ye*, &c. I have tranſlated this paſſage interrogatively; referring the words בדבר הזה to the *matter* then in queſtion; and as making a part of Moſes's ſpeech to the Iſraelites at the time of their rebellion, after the return of the ſpies. So Saadias. And 5 Sam. MSS. have the interrogation ה before בדבר. The referring of this and the next verſe to the period in which Moſes now ſpeaks, or rather repeats what he had ſaid before, is contrary to ſenſe, analogy, and conſtruction. Yet I do not find that it has been noticed by any modern critic.

Ver. 39. *Who as yet know not good nor evil.* It is well remarked by Secker, that our common verſion is here faulty: "which in THAT day," &c. againſt all the antient verſions†.

Ver. 41. *Ye were ready.* תזינו. It is not eaſy to analyſe this word, which occurs but once in the Hebrew Scriptures. There is ſome variety of reading in the MSS. but of ſmall or no

* From Deut. 17. 18. where the ſame words occur. † Sep. σημερον—Vulg. *hodie*—Onk. and Tharg. יומא —Syr. יומנא—Both Arabs. אליום—Perſ. רוז—Gr. Ven. σημερον—And ſo indeed equivalently all the foreign modern tranſlators from Pagninus downward; with our own Bate and Purver: the former of whom has: "who know not "*as yet* good or evil:" the latter: "who *now* know not either good or evil."—I wonder that Delgado did not correct this miſtake in our common verſion.

importance.

importance. The antient interpreters vary. Sep. συναθροισθεντες—Vulg. *parati*—Onk. and Tharg. שריתן or שריתן—Syr. אתגרנתן—Saad. באדרתם—Erp. בדיתם—Gr. Ven. εσπουσατε.—Some modern critics derive the Heb. word from the Arabic הזן, *facilis esse*; and in some of its inflections *vilipendere*. Hence they bring a double explication of תזינו; the one, *faciles vos præbuistis*; the other, *despexistis*: i. e. *rem nullius negotii putastis* montem ascendere. So Dathe: but Michaëlis and Rosenmüller, who consider the meaning of זין to be simply *contemnere*, supply *monitum Domini*: as if Moses had said: "But ye despised *the Lord's admonition*, and would "go up to the mountain."—But such an ellipsis, in my opinion, is here totally inadmissible.—Dathe's hypothesis is far more specious; but I cannot think that he has hit upon the true derivation. I am inclined to believe, with the Rabbins Kimhi, Rashi, and Aben-Ezrah, that תזינו is a fictitious verb from הן *ecce*. In Numb. 14. 40. where the same story is related, the people are made to say: הננו: "Lo, *here* we *are*." Moses, in rehearsing this in Deuteronomy, turns their exclamation into a verb, תזינו; as if we were to say: *Ye lo-here-we-are'd it*: just as we say of a song, or piece of music: *They encored it*. Nay, I have heard it said of a popular toast, that *they three-times-threed it*. Such compositions, I believe, will be found in most languages.

Ver. 44. *By Seir*. בשעיר. So both texts, with Onk. Tharg. both Arabs. Pers. and Gr. Ven. But Sep. seem to have read in their copy משעיר, απο Σηειρ—So Vulg. *de Seir*—and Syr. מן שעיר. This is no improbable reading: the ב and מ have been frequently interchanged; as hath been already remarked.

CHAP. II.

Ver. 10—12. I CANNOT perhaps do better than here transcribe the remark of the author of *Commentaries and Essays*: "These verses seem to be an interpolation, perhaps first placed "in the margin, from which they crept into the text; as may have been the case with some "other passages in this and other books of the Old Testament, and even in this chapter. But "I take notice of this more particularly, as the interpolation is more plainly marked, than in "some others: for it cuts in two the speech of God to Moses, and by a parenthesis in the "midst of a speech, which has nothing to do with that speech, and which refers to a fact poste-"rior to that speech *, as already past, betrays its non-authenticity in the most glaring manner. "Leave out these three verses, and the 9th and 13th will appear connected... Our translators, "indeed, add the words (said I), as if Moses were the speaker here. No such thing, however, "is in the text; but it is the speech of God to Moses, commanding them to go over the brook "Zered: and accordingly Moses adds: 'and went over the brook Zered.'..... Verses 20, 21, "22, 23, seem an interpolation of the like kind, inserted also in the midst of a speech of God "to Moses." p. 303.—In ver. 12. instead of *The children of Esau dispossessed and destroyed them, and dwelled in their stead*: the Sam. copy has: *The children of Esau dispossessed them, for the Lord destroyed them from before them: so they dispossessed them*, &c. See Var. Read. vol. i. p. 303.

* He alludes to these words—"like as did the Israelites in the land, which the Lord gave to them for a possession:" which could not be written by Moses, because it records what was done after the time of Moses, after Israel had got possession of Chanaan. See Kennicott's Remarks, p. 72. There are critics, however, who fancy that this difficulty is fully obviated, by giving to נתן, *he gave*, the meaning of *he meant to give*. It gives one pain to find Rosenmüller adopting this conceit.

Ver. 20—23.

Ver. 20—23. The various readings in this interpolation are as follow: The Rom. ed. of Sep. in ver. 20. has Ζοχομμων inſtead of Ζομζομμειν: which latter is the reading of Alex. Ald. has Ζομμειν; and Comp. with Ox. have Ζομμειν or Ζομμιν. It is remarkable, however, that the Coptic verſion follows the Vatican lection. The *caph* and *mem* in the old Heb. characters are very like one another; and were therefore eaſily interchanged.—In ver. 21. after *a people great and powerful*, or *great and numerous*, גדול ורב, the Septuagint add και δυνατωτερον. ὑμων in Rom. and Comp. And ſo Copt. But Ald. has only the addition of και ισχυρον: and Alex. and Glaſg. have only και δυνατωτερον without ὑμιν. We wait for Dr. Holmes's collation. In the preſent original there is only ורם, by Jerom rendered *proceræ longitudinis*: and ſo equivalently all the other verſions.—In ver. 22. Sep. Rom. and Compl. have ὡσπερ εποιησαν, as if they had read עשו inſtead of עשה (which was eaſily done in the ant. characters): but Ald. Alex. and Glaſg. have εποιησεν. The Coptic verſion follows Rom.—In ver. 23. inſtead of *Hazerim*, חצרים, Sep. in ed. Rom. has Ασηδωθ: but Ald. Comp. Alex. Glaſg. with Copt. have either Ασηρωθ or Ασειρωθ.

Ver. 25. *Begin.* The preſent Heb. has אחל, I will begin: but Sam. and one of Kennicott's MSS. have החל: and ſo Sep. Εναρχου; as in the preceding verſe, and again in ver. 31.

Ver. 29. What is ſaid in this verſe of the children of Eſau and the Moabites is contrary to the hiſtory as related in Numbers 20. 18—20. Hear Roſenmüller's mode of reconciling the two paſſages: "Quum Moſes hiſtoriam itineris Iſraelitarum breviter duntaxat narraverit, "ad horum locorum conciliationem nil certi poteſt afferri. *Fortaſſe* Iſraelitæ compendioſo in "Cananæam uti itinere cupientes, per mediam tranſire voluerunt Idumæam, id quod obtinere "non potuerunt: impetraverunt tantum hoc, ut libera paſcua in Deſerto ad fines Idumææ "legerent, ibique in finibus tranſeuntes ab Idumæis alimenta et aquas pretio acciperent. *For-* "*taſſe* Edomitæ initio Iſraelitis tranſitum conceſſerunt, quem poſtea denegarunt." He might have inverted this laſt *fortaſſe*; and ſaid as well: "Edomitæ initio denegarunt tranſitum, "quem poſtea conceſſerunt." The truth is: neither at firſt, nor at laſt, did the Edomites grant a paſſage to the Iſraelites. They were twice explicitly denied a paſſage; and "turned "another way." Numb. 20. 21.

Ver. 36. *From Aroer, the city,* &c. That the city, here mentioned, is no other than Aroer itſelf, to me appears plain, from comparing chap. 3. 12. and Joſh. 13. 9. The ſecond comma והעיר אשר בנחל is only a more explicit determination of the ſite of Aroer. So rightly Jerom: *ab Aroer, quæ eſt ſuper ripam torrentis, oppido quod in valle ſitum eſt, uſque Galaad.* See Rem. on Joſh. 13. 9.

CHAP. III.

Ver. 9. *SIRION.* שרין, or rather שריון as it is written in 19 MSS. Sep. have Σανιωρ; and one might imagine this to have been the original reading. It is leſs probable that two neighbouring nations would call the ſame mountain by names ſo different as *Sirion* and *Senir* or *Shenir*: whereas there is only a very ſmall dialectic difference between *Sanior* and *Senir*.

Ver. 11. *Whoſe coffin.* The Heb. word is ערש, which commonly ſignifies *a bed*. But as it is here called *a bed of iron*; it is highly probable that it denotes *a coffin*; which meaning it has

in Arabic *. The Greeks uſed ἰσμη in the ſame ſenſe. Oreſtes in the *Chœphoræ* of Eſchylus 316 calls his father's *bier*, or *tomb*, by that name. On this interpolation I ſhall preſent my readers with Dathe's note: "De hac pericopa multo magis quam de illis in precedente capite "dubitari poteſt, an ſit a manu Moſis, et non potius ab alia addita. Minimè quidem neceſſa- "rium videtur, ut Moſes Iſraelitas doceat Ogum Baſanis regem fuiſſe gigantem, quippe eum "viderant, et prælio cum eo decertarant. Verbum ערש verti non *lectum*, ſed *feretrum*, ex con- "jectura Michaëlis non improbabili . . . Sed ſive per *lectum*, ſive per *feretrum* vertatur, neutrum "Iſraelitis innoteſcere potuit, antequam David hanc Ammonitarum metropolin expugnaret "2 Sam. 3. 31. multo minus Moſi, qui non ita longe poſt illud prælium cum Ogo commiſſum "e vita deceſſit."—Indeed, any one who can believe that Moſes wrote this, is ripe for believing any thing.—But why was the coffin of Og, a king of Baſhan, to be ſeen at the capital of the Ammonites, and not at his own capital Aſhtaroth? To this it is anſwered, with ſome probability, that, being wounded in the battle with the Iſraelites, he fled to Rabbath, and died and was buried there. So Michaëlis.

I have yet to remark on this verſe, that in the preſent Hebrew there is a word which ſeems to be an evident corruption: הלה for הלא; which latter is the reading of Sam. and of 13 of Kennicott's, and many of De Roſſi's MSS. It was alſo read by all the ant. tranſlators down to Gr. Ven. incluſively.

Ver. 17. *Aſhdoth-Phiſga*. I have retained the Hebrew name אשדות הפשגה: but I have little doubt, that אשדות means the *ſtreams*, or *cataracts*, that fell from the mountain Phiſga. See Rem. on ch. 33. 2.

CHAP. IV.

Ver. 19. *TO the worſhip of which*, &c. אשר חלק יהוה אלהיך אתם. "In his verbis utique eſt "agnoſcendus ſingularis ille loquendi uſus, ſecundum quem Hebræi quæcunque hominum facta "ſeu conſuetudines, inſtituta a Deo profecta ſolent appellare. Itaque ſenſus verborum illorum "eſt hic: Quæ aſtra a cunctis exteris coli ſolerent, et quidem ita ut unus populus ſolem, alius "lunam, &c. cultu divino proſequeretur: hoc enim hoc loco ſignificat verbum חלק." Roſenmüller. For the reſt, the word כל before the laſt השמים is wanting in Sep. Vulg. and Syr. The other verſions mentioned in Var. Read. p. 307. belong not to this claſs. They relate to the word אשר before תחת, which was read by Sep. Vulg. Syr. Onk. Tharg. Saad. Erp. but wanting in Perſ. and Gr. Ven. One of Kennicott's MSS. has (and another at firſt had) אשר; and this was the firſt reading of 2 of De Roſſi's.—The foremention ed various reading is to be thus corrected. It is not, however, of much importance; as the text is, either way, complete in the ſenſe.

Ver. 20. *An iron furnace*: כור הברזל. Which words are not to be underſtood of a *furnace made of iron*; although Sep. and Vulg. ſeem ſo to have underſtood them †; but a furnace for

* It is the ſame with the Syr. ערס or ארסא; which in the Syr. verſion of Luke 7. 14. correſponds with the Greek σορος. ואול קרב לערסא—και προσελθων ἡψατο της σορου. † εκ της καιμινου της σιδηρας—*de fornace ferrea*. Not ſo Gr. Ven. which has very properly απο της χωνης του σιδηρου. The Oriental verſions are ambiguous; but ought to be underſtood as the Hebrew.

ſmelting

ſmelting iron, than which nothing can be more tremendous. Take Roſenmüller's deſcription of it: "Rotunda ſolet eſſe forma*, triginta fere aut plurium pedum altitudine; ſtrata habens "carbonum mineræque ferri contuſæ ſibi invicem impoſita (ita tamen ut ſummum ſtratum "carbonum eſſe oporteat); ingenti folle ignem exſufflante, qui pulchrum oculis et terribile "ſpectaculum præbet. In hac fornace ferrum ex minera excoquitur, acerrimo, quem ars "metallurgorum efficere poteſt, igne.—Ob hunc vero ardorem non ferendum, et ob aſpectum, "quem noctu imprimis præbet, terribilem, talis fornax aptè dicitur *de ſervitute iſta intoleranda, "qua Iſraelitæ in Egypto preſſi fuerunt, cujuſque memoria iis terribilis eſſe debebat.*"

Ver. 34. wrongly marked in Var. Read. 33. *By ſuch great tremendous miracles.* The text has במוראים גדלים, *in terroribus magnis.* But Sam. has במראים, *in viſionibus:* and ſo read Sep. εν ὁραμασι μεγαλοις—Vulg. *per horribiles viſiones*—Onk. בחזונין רברבין—and ſo alſo Tharg. and Syr. But both Arabs, Perſ. and Gr. Ven. ſeem to have read as the preſent text. I have expreſſed in my verſion both readings.

Ver. 37. In the preſent Heb. text there is in this verſe a ſhameful corruption—בזרעו אחריו, for בזרעם אחריהם, which is the Sam. lection. And ſo all the ant. interpreters; ſave Tharg. Arab. Erp. Perſ. and Gr. Ven. who ſeem to have had before them the preſent faulty reading: which, however, our Rabbinical critics call only an *enallage.* If ſuch an *enallage* had been found in the Sam. copy, we ſhould have heard of it, by both ears.—The late Bp. Law has in his MS. notes given to בפניו, in this verſe, a different meaning, "by his preſence," *i. e.* his protection. Nor is this at all an improper or improbable rendering. Moſt of the ant. tranſlators ſeem ſo to have underſtood it. The Septuagint, indeed, either read not the word in their copy, or overlooked it. But Jerom has *præcedens*—Onk. במימריה—Syr. בפרצופה, which may be rendered *by his preſence.* So equivalently Saad. and Perſ. But Arab. Erp. and Gr. Ven. favour the other rendering. It is nearly all the ſame.

Ver. 48. *Unto Sirion:* for ſo it is called in chap. 3. 9. and ſo it is here written in the Syriac verſion. The preſent Heb. has שיאן; but the Sam. copy has שיאון: and this is the reading of Sep. Vulg. Onk. Tharg. both Arabs, Perſ. and Gr. Ven.: ſo that a cloud of witneſſes favour the preſent reading. Yet, I confeſs, I am ſtrongly inclined to believe, that Syr. alone has preſerved the true reading; and have therefore inſerted it in my verſion. Dathe acknowledges its *probability*; although he has left *Sion* in his tranſlation †. It is remarkable that the Coptic verſion, made from the Septuagint, has *Sanior* here, as in chap. 3. 9. See the Rem. on that verſe.

CHAP. V.

Ver. 11. SEE the Rem. on Exod. 20. 7.

Ver. 21. *Thou ſhalt not covet thy neighbour's wife.* This precept in Exodus, in the preſent Heb. and moſt verſions, is placed after *Thou ſhalt not covet thy neighbour's houſe:* but, as all

* The word כור in its radical meaning imports *rotundity.* † "In textu Heb. ſcribitur hoc nomen *Sion:* "pro quo legendum *Sirion* ex cap. 3. 9. ubi Sidonios ſic hunc montem vocaſſe narratur. Syrus interpres habet quoque "illud nomen in utroque loco: ſed quoniam reliqui cum textu Heb. conſentiunt, nolui hanc lectionem, quanquam pro- "babilem, in verſionem recipere."—As *authority*, with me, begets not always *probabiliority*, I have had no ſcruple in placing in my text what I deemed, independently of authority, the moſt probable reading.

the copies and verſions here agree, and as Sep. with one Heb. MS. follows the ſame order in Exod. I have in both places kept to it. It is indeed of ſmall moment, in itſelf; yet has given riſe to a violent controverſy about the proper diviſion of the *ten commandments*, between the Roman Catholics and the Proteſtants. The former, with St. Auſtin, conſidered *Thou ſhalt not covet thy neighbour's wife*, as a precept diſtinct from that which follows; adhering to the order of arrangement in Deuteronomy: and that the number might not exceed *ten*, they took *Thou ſhalt not make to thyſelf a carved idol, &c*, as a part, and further explanation, of the firſt, *Thou ſhalt have no other gods, beſide me*. The Proteſtants declaimed againſt this diviſion; and ſome of them pretended that it was made of purpoſe to favour *image-worſhip*; as if the ſecond commandment had been altogether thrown out of the Decalogue. But this was pure miſrepreſentation; although it has been occaſionally propagated to the preſent day, and by perſons who are deemed *maſters in Iſrael*. In ſhorter catechiſms and elementary books of inſtruction, the commandments are ſometimes abridged thus: *Thou ſhalt have no other gods, before me*, &c.—*Thou ſhalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain*, &c.—*Remember to keep holy the ſabbath day*, &c.—*Honour thy father and thy mother*, &c.—*Thou ſhalt not covet thy neighbour's houſe*, &c.—But in all bodies of doctrine, and in the *Catechiſmus ad Parochos*, commonly called The Catechiſm of the Council of Trent, there is no ſuch abbreviation uſed: nor was ſuch abbreviation ever thought of as a ſcreen to conceal *idolatry*; as too many Proteſtants have aſſerted.

As to the diviſion itſelf, I am of opinion that the Roman Catholics are in the wrong. The Proteſtant diviſion, which is that of Joſephus*, is more agreeable to the original text, in which there is no copulative between what Proteſtants call the firſt and the ſecond; by the Romaniſts joined in one: whereas there is uniformly a copulative between the laſt two in the Roman diviſion; whether *wife* be put before *houſe*, as in Deuteronomy, or *houſe* before *wife*, as in Exodus.

Ver. 29. *And keep my commandments.* I follow Sam. Sep. Saad. who read not כל before משמרתי: which, however, was read by all the other tranſlators down to Gr. Ven. incluſively: and, conſequently, it is an almoſt equally probable reading. On the whole, it is all one: for *the* precepts of the Lord are *all* his precepts. See the Rem. on ch. 27. 26.

CHAP. VI.

Ver. 4. *THE Lord, the Lord only, is our God:* יהוה אלהינו יהוה אחד: by our tranſlators rendered, "The Lord our God *is* one Lord:" which, by Delgado, is thus corrected: "The Lord "*is* our God, the Lord is one:" as if there were two propoſitions in the comma: and Doc-

* The diviſion of Joſephus is the more remarkable, as he not only ſeparates the commands, in different ſentences; but prefixes the words *firſt, ſecond, third*, &c. to the reſpective precepts. Διδασκει μεν ουν Ὁ ΠΡΟΤΟΣ λογος, οτι Θεος εστιν εις, και τουτον σεβεσθαι μονον.—Ὁ δε ΔΕΥΤΕΡΟΣ κελευσει, μηδενος εικονα ζωου ποιησαντας προσκυνειν —Ὁ δε ΤΡΙΤΟΣ δε, μηδενι φαυλῳ τον Θεον ομυναι—Ὁ δε ΤΕΤΑΡΤΟΣ, παρατηρειν τας ἑβδομαδας, αποπαυομενους απο παντος εργου—Ὁ δε ΠΕΜΠΤΟΣ, γονεις τιμαν—Ὁ δε ΕΧΤΟΣ, αποσχεσθαι φονου—Ὁ δε ΕΒΔΟΜΟΣ, μη μοιχευειν—Ὁ δε ΟΓΔΟΟΣ, μη κλοπην δραν—Ὁ δε ΕΝΝΑΤΟΣ, μη ψευδομαρτυρειν—Ὁ δε ΔΕΚΑΤΟΣ, μηδενος αλλοτριου επιθυμιαν λαμβανειν. Ant. lib. iii. c. 5. No. 5. p. 129. This diviſion correſponds with that of Philo, and was followed by the Greek Fathers, and by the Latin Fathers too, before Auſtin.

tor

tor Campbell has, in a note on Mark 12. 29. laboured to prove that this is the true meaning. Vitringa was of the ſame opinion: and it muſt be allowed that it is ſpecious. I cannot however ſubſcribe to it, for the following reaſons: 1ſt, It was differently underſtood by all the antient interpreters; who conſidered the words as only one propoſition: although, I think, they did not render them in the moſt proper terms *. 2dly, The Hebrew idiom ſeems repugnant to ſuch a conſtruction. I am therefore inclined to think, that אחד here means not ſimply *one*, but *alone* and *ſingular*: ſuch as the God of the Hebrews is every where deſcribed. The natural interpretation then will be; "The Lord *is* our God, the Lord only:" or, as I have rendered, "The Lord, the Lord only, is our God." "Occurrit ita Moſes ei gentilium ſuper-"ſtitioni, quæ ſæpe unum eundemque Deum factitium, velut Baalem, Jovem, ſub diverſis "nominibus colebat; adeoque non ſolum plures deos, ſed etiam unum eundemque Deum, "diverſis nominibus, in plures alios longè diverſos deos quaſi multiplicatum, ſtulta religione "venerabatur." Roſenmüller.

Ver. 8. *Inſcribe them* (the commands of God) *on the poſts of your houſes*, &c. It is ſtill cuſtomary among the Arabs, and other oriental nations, to write paſſages of the Koran, and other moral ſentences, on the gates of cities, walls, and door-poſts. See Niebuhr and other travellers in the Eaſt.

Ver. 13. I will here inſert Kennicott's note, for the ſake of making ſome obſervations on it: "Thou ſhalt fear the Lord thy God, AND SERVE HIM. The Scripture tells us, that ſome men "worſhipped falſe gods together with the true. And if this text commanded the worſhip of "*the God of Iſrael*, and not of him only, it would not clearly condemn ſuch falſe communion: "nor would it be concluſive, as CHRIST himſelf has quoted it. The context, when clear, is a "ſafe guide; and here it is quite *excluſive*. It therefore follows, that the Heb. text ואתו תעבד "was originally ואתו לבדו תעבד, '*et ei* SOLI *ſervies*;' as in the Greek and Vulgate verſions. "This reading, thus confirmed, juſtifies the citation of it made by *Chriſt*, when he put the "Tempter to ſilence and flight, by ſaying, IT IS WRITTEN: *And Him* ONLY *ſhalt thou ſerve*. "Matt. 4. 10. Luke 4. 8."——Although it be probable, that the Septuagint, and perhaps Jerom, read in their copies the word לבדו, it is not an abſolute proof that it ſo ſtood in the original. There is no veſtige of it in either the preſent Heb. or Sam. copies; nor in any of the other verſions: and Chriſt's citing it in his anſwer to the Tempter is not a ſure guarantee for its originality. He quoted it, as it was then read in the Jewiſh ſynagogues, from the Septuagint, or perhaps from a Syriac verſion correſponding with Sep. But it was Dr. Kennicott's method to make the quotations in the N. T. a criterion of the text of the O. T.; which is contrary to the canons of ſound criticiſm.—For the reſt, it is clear that the word לבדו, *only*, is underſtood throughout this verſe: although in my verſion I have only once put it in common letters, on the foreſaid authority of Sep. and Vulg.

* Sep. Κυριος ὁ θεος ἡμων κυριος εἱς ἐστι—Vulg. *Dominus deus noſter Dominus unus eſt*—and ſo equivalently Onk. Tharg. Syr. both Arabs. and Perſ. none of which, I conceive, expreſſes the force of the original. The Greek of Venice comes the higheſt: ὁ ονπωτης ὁ θεος ἡμων ὁ ονπωτης εἱς: and if εἱς be ever allowed to mean *ſolus*, *alone*, it would be in my eſtimation a complete and literal rendering.

CHAP.

CHAP. VII.

Ver. 7. DOCTOR Kennicott's Rem. on this verſe is more pertinent: "The nations, driven "out by Iſrael, are here enumerated thus: *Hittites, Girgaſites, Amorites, Canaanites, Perizzites,* "*Hivites, Jebuſites:* and they are expreſsly called SEVEN. They are alſo named in ſix other parts of the Pentateuch; but in the Heb. text imperfectly in all theſe ſix places . . . but in all "theſe places the ſeven nations are all expreſſed in the Sam. Pentateuch."—He might have added that, in all thoſe places, the Sam. copy is ſupported by Sep.

Ver. 2. *Ye ſhall devote them* [the Chanaanite nations] *to utter deſtruction*—החרם תחרים אתם—Sep. αφανισμῳ αφανιεις αυτους—Vulg. *percuties eas* [gentes] *uſque ad internecionem*—Onk. נגמרא תגמר יתהון—and ſtill more explicitly Tharg. ותמחינון גמרא תגמרון יתהון בשמתא דיי—Syr. ומתרמו תחרמון אנון—and ſo equivalently both Arabs, Perſ. and Gr. Ven. whoſe verſion is as ſtrong as any, βαλεις τ᾽αυτους τῳ εξολοθρευειν εξολοθρευσεις αυτους.—In ſhort, nothing can be clearer than that the utter deſtruction of the ſeven Chanaanite nations is enjoined in this Moſaical precept: nor was this doubted by any tranſlator, interpreter, or commentator, till toward the cloſe of the eighteenth century. They all tell us, indeed, that it was a *reaſonable*, a *neceſſary* command: for that "to ſpare ſuch rank, incurable idolaters would have been cruelty to themſelves and "their poſterity*." But ſtill they allow that ſuch a precept was given, and endeavour to juſtify it by reaſonings, which, to me, appear frivolous in the extreme, and totally repugnant to the evangelical doctrines of Chriſtianity.—It was this conſideration, I doubt not, which induced ſome very modern writers to maintain, that ſuch an injunction was never given!

Not ſo the candid, the learned, the liberal prelate, who wrote, a ſhort while ago, an *Apology for the Bible*. He was conſcious that the fact could not be controverted; but he endeavours to juſtify it on principles, which at firſt ſight ſeem ſpecious; but which, in my apprehenſion, will not bear a minute inſpection. He is aſtoniſhed that the author of *The Age of Reaſon* "ſhould attempt to diſparage the Bible by bringing forward the *exploded* and *frequently refuted*† "objection of Morgan, Tindal, and Bolingbroke—You profeſs yourſelf (adds he) to be a Deiſt, "and to believe that there is a God, who created the univerſe and eſtabliſhed the laws of "nature, by which it is ſuſtained in exiſtence. You profeſs, that from the contemplation of "the works of God you derive a knowledge of his attributes; and you reject the Bible, "becauſe it aſcribes to God things inconſiſtent (as you ſuppoſe) with the attributes which you "have diſcovered to belong to him: and, in particular, you think it repugnant to his moral "juſtice, that he ſhould doom to deſtruction the crying or ſmiling infants of the Canaanites. "Why do you not maintain it to be repugnant to his moral juſtice, that he ſhould ſuffer

* Were not the Moabites, and Ammonites, and other neighbouring nations, as groſs idolaters as the Chanaanite nations? Yet there is no injunction to utterly deſtroy them. It was not then the mere idolatry of the Chanaanites that brought about their deſtruction; but their idolatry and other abominations were made pretexts to diſpoſſeſs them of their lands and properties, in order to transfer them to the Iſraelites. † This mode of expreſſion, ſo common among controverſialiſts, I confeſs I never could reliſh. It may be equally uſed, and has been uſed, by both parties: for nothing is more eaſy to ſay than—"Your argument has already been often anſwered and confuted." Bellarmine might ſay ſo to Barclay, and Barclay to Bellarmine: and, if Bolingbroke, Tindal or Morgan were now alive, they would moſt probably deny that their arguments had been refuted. Certainly, every *anſwer* is not a *refutation*.

"crying

" crying or ſmiling infants to be ſwallowed up by an earthquake, drowned by an inundation, " conſumed by a fire, ſtarved by a famine, or deſtroyed by a peſtilence? The word of God is " in perfect harmony with his work: crying or ſmiling infants are ſubjected to death in both. " .... When Catania, Lima and Liſbon were ſeverally deſtroyed by earthquakes; men with " their wives, their ſons and their little ones, were ſwallowed up alive: why do you not ſpurn, " as ſpurious, the book of nature, in which this fact is certainly written, and from the peruſal " of which you infer the moral juſtice of God*?"

In the Preface to the ſecond volume of my verſion of the Bible (p. ii. in the note) I have ſaid, that it grieved me to read in a late elegant *Apology* ſo lame a juſtification of the paſſage in queſtion; and added: "I *am tempted* ſometimes *to think*, that the R. R. author muſt have " felt the weakneſs of his argument, and ſeen the diſparity of his ſimile." I uſed the words *tempted to think*, becauſe I could not bring myſelf to believe that the Biſhop *did* feel the weakneſs of his argument. I am perſuaded that he conſidered it as a ſtrong argument: and, perhaps, what I am now going to write againſt it, will not move him to alter his opinion. I will, however, make an eſſay.

In the firſt place, then, I truſt his Lordſhip will agree with me, that there is but one clear, explicit, immutable law of moral equity, implanted by the wiſe Creator in the human mind: ALTERI NE FECERIS, QUOD TIBI FIERI NON VIS. It is this law which, independent of any revelation, tells us, that we muſt not ſteal, we muſt not kill, we muſt not injure our neighbour: and if this hold good, and be obligatory with reſpect to individuals, it muſt be equally ſo with regard to whole families, tribes and nations, which are compoſed of individuals. According to this, I believe indiſputable, principle, the Iſraelitic nation had no more right to invade, diſpoſſeſs and exterminate the Chanaanites, than theſe had to invade, diſpoſſeſs and exterminate the Iſraelites. " True (it will poſſibly be ſaid) in the abſtract, and bating particular " circumſtances: but God, who is the ſovereign arbiter of the world, and author of the laws " of nature, whether *phyſical* or *moral*, may, when he pleaſes and ſees occaſion, diſpenſe with " the general moral law ALTERI NE FECERIS, &c. and give a ſpecial poſitive law in direct " oppoſition to it."—I might obſtinately deny this aſſertion, and maintain that he could not, without being himſelf unjuſt: nor do I ſee what ſolid argument could be adduced to prove the contrary; for I preſume my antagoniſt would hardly have recourſe to the argument of tyrants: SUCH IS OUR PLEASURE.—But, granting that an arbitrary, omnipotent Being have a right to transfer my property to you, and authoriſe you to murder me and mine offſpring for the purpoſe of ſecuring that transfer; I muſt have ſtrong proofs indeed of the exiſtence of ſuch an inſtrument, and of its having been iſſued from the chancery of Heaven, before I could *ſubmit* to ſo uncommon a diſpenſation of providence: and even then, I fear, it would only be a bare ſubmiſſion: my ſoul would interiorly murmur, and wonder how this could be reconcileable with the juſtice of that Supreme Being, who has ſo deeply imprinted on the tablet of my mind, the idea, that no one is to do to another, what he wiſhes not to be done to himſelf.—" But " what if I were an egregious ſinner, who had deſerved to be diſpoſſeſſed of my property and " bereaved of my life?"—An egregious ſinner! In the eſtimation of whom? Not ſurely of you my deſtroyer! I ſhould conſider you as a partial judge; and might deem you as great a

* Apology, p. 14, 15, 16.

ſinner

ſinner as myſelf. "Not merely in my eſtimation (you reply), but in the eſtimation of God; "who, knowing all things, muſt know, that you are a moſt enormous ſinner, deſerving death "and deſtruction."—Be it ſo—he has a thouſand ways and means to deſtroy me, without employing you as an inſtrument—and before I believe that he has choſen you for that purpoſe, I muſt have far other proofs than your bare aſſertion; eſpecially as I find that you are intereſted in the matter, and are to reap the fruits of my deſtruction. But if the order, which you ſay you have received from heaven, be to diſpoſſeſs and deſtroy not only my *guilty* ſelf, but my *guiltleſs* infants and poſterity, I become ſtill more aſtoniſhed and more incredulous; and deſire to ſee and peruſe your commiſſion, with the broad ſeal of Heaven upon it:—nay, were you to produce ſuch a commiſſion in the name of Heaven, I ſhould inſiſt on its being a fabrication of your own; and that it could not come from the ſame God who ſays: *that children ſhall not be puniſhed for the ſins of their fathers.*

Now, as we have no other proof that God commanded Moſes and his Iſraelites (who themſelves were ſo ſinful a people that he often threatened to deſtroy them) to diſpoſſeſs and extirpate the Chanaanites, man, woman, and infant, than the bare aſſertion of an Hebrew hiſtorian—ſuppoſe it even to be Moſes himſelf—the Chanaanites muſt have neceſſarily conſidered the God of Moſes as an unjuſt God; or believed, that the pretended command to diſpoſſeſs and exterminate them was a counterfeit.—We are then, I think, warranted to ſay that it is infinitely more probable that God never gave ſuch an order, ſo oppoſite to the general law of moral equity, than that he diſpenſed with this law, in favour of a particular nation, with reſpect to the Chanaanites; howſoever great their ſins or grievous their abominations: which, by the bye, we know only from the ſame partial intereſted pen, that has recorded the decree of their proſcription.

I cannot help dwelling yet a little longer on this topic. Suppoſe *yourſelf*, my Lord Biſhop of Landaff, to be living in the quiet poſſeſſion of your own eſtate in Weſtmoreland; and then ſuppoſe *me* to be a Gallican refugee biſhop, eſcaped from the tyranny of Robeſpierre, and the fangs of French atheiſm. Were I, in this ſuppoſition, to claim your inheritance, under the pretext that I had a ſpecial commiſſion from God to diſpoſſeſs and extirpate you and your race; would you not call in queſtion the veracity of the document? Would you tamely ſubmit to be deſpoiled of your life and fortune; and not try to repel force by force? In vain might I allege, that you were a grievous ſinner, a vile obſtinate heretic, an enemy to God and his ſpouſe the Church; and on that account meriting extermination: you would, with indignation, deny the charge; and perhaps retaliate, and call me, in return, a ſuperſtitious idolater. —Deem not this a jocular argument: I meant it as a very ſerious one.

The Chanaanites were in much the ſame predicament, when they were invaded by the Iſraelites, as your Lordſhip would be, if invaded by a Romiſh fugitive biſhop: nor am I very ſure, but that the Romiſh biſhop could produce even more plauſible arguments for the expulſion and perdition of an Engliſh heretic, than the Iſraelites could bring for expelling and extirpating the idolatrous Chanaanites. At leaſt, he would not fail to make uſe of the command to exterminate the Chanaanites, as a divine precedent, which he might ſafely follow: and in this he would do no more than has been done not only by the religioniſts of Rome, but by thoſe of all other denominations, when they had a mind to perſecute and proſcribe thoſe

of

of a different creed. And this naturally leads me to take notice of the Biſhop's ſimile; which, in my opinion, halts exceedingly.

When the earthquake ſwallows up, the ſea overwhelms, the fire conſumes, the famine ſtarves, or the plague deſtroys; we are totally ignorant by what laws of nature, or concatenation of cauſes, the deſolating events happen: we ſee only the diſmal effects: and no conſequence can rationally be deduced from them, againſt the principle of moral equity, ſo often before mentioned. From ſuch events no one could derive an argument for the lawfulneſs of diſpoſſeſſing or injuring his neighbour, either in his property or perſon; no argument for the lawfulneſs of burying alive idolaters, drowning heretics, ſtarving atheiſts, &c. &c. From ſuch events the famous Biſhop of Cagliari, Lucifer, could never have inferred, that it was the duty of the orthodox to kill the Arians, and even the Emperor Conſtantius, who abetted Arianiſm*. From the earthquakes at Catania, Lima, Liſbon, the Holy Inquiſition could never have concluded that it was lawful and meritorious to burn the bodies and confiſcate the goods of Moors, Jews, and wicked infidels. But the expreſs command of God to extirpate whole nations on account of their ſins, and to transfer their goods and chattels to another choſen people, was a precedent exactly ſuited to their ſanguinary purpoſes, and triumphantly employed by them to obviate all objections, on the ſcore of cruelty.

The ſame inferential arguments were made uſe of in the Valdenſian perſecution, and indeed in every perſecution for the ſake of religion, ſince perſecution began. The ſuppoſed divine commiſſion given to the Jews to extirpate the Chanaanites, and Amalekites, has ever been, in the mouths of Judaizing Chriſtians, a poſitive and plauſible plea for committing the moſt cruel injuſtices.

On the whole, then, I muſt repeat it; I cannot poſſibly believe, that ever a juſt, benevolent Being, ſuch as I conceive *my* God to be, gave ſuch a ſanguinary order to Moſes and the Iſraelites, as in the book of Deuteronomy he is ſaid to have given.—Let others think otherwiſe: I will not quarrel with them on that account: nor ſhall I again return to the ſubject, on any provocation.

Ver. 10. *But inſtantly repaying thoſe who diſregard him, by deſtroying them.* The Hebrew is ומשלם לשנאיו אל פניו להאבידו; in our common verſion rendered, "and repayeth them that hate "him to their face, to deſtroy them." The difficulty lies in the words אל פניו, or, as Sam. על פניו: which are variouſly rendered by the antients—Sep. κατα προσωπον—Vulg. *ſtatim*—Onk. קדמודי—Syr. בחיהון, *in vita eorum*—and ſo equivalently both Thargums, and Arab. Erp. followed by Roſenmüller†.—Michaëlis, after Grotius, imagines that אל פניו here ſignifies *openly*,

* See his five Declamations againſt the Emperor, in the fourth volume of *Bibliotheca Patrum*; or in the 8vo edition of Paris 1568. This work was highly applauded by the Athanaſian party; who conſidered him as the organ of the Holy Ghoſt, on this occaſion; without whoſe ſpecial aſſiſtance (they ſaid) he could never have ſo well underſtood, and ſo properly applied, the texts of holy writ!

† "Equidem verba vertere malim, cum Syro et Arabe Erpeniano "*in vita ejus*; dum adhuc in vivis eſt, improbum pœnis, quas meritus eſt, afficit. Quæ interpretatio non repugnat uſui "loquendi, uti Dathio viſum eſt. Nam infra c. 21. 17. (16.) אל פני ſignificat *ſuperſtite adhuc, dum in vita eſt.* i. q. "על פני Gen. 11. 28. Num. 3. 4."—But not one of theſe examples is, in my opinion, available againſt Dathe's objection: as they are all reſolvable into another acceptation, and meet not the preſent caſe.—Houbigant, however, was of a different opinion, as he renders *dum vivunt*; equivalent to Roſenmüller's *ſuperſtitet adhuc.* Jarhi and ſome other Rabbins explain the words in a ſimilar manner.

 manifeſtly,

manifeſtly, before their eyes: and this meaning is not a little favoured by a ſimilar uſe of κατα προσωπον in Greek; which are here uſed by Sep. and by the apoſtle Paul, Galat. 2. 11. κατα προσωπον αυτῳ αντεστην.—Dathe rejects all theſe interpretations, as contrary to the uſual modes of ſpeech: "In his omnibus deſidero probationem ex uſu loquendi. Mihi quidem "videtur פנים dictum eſſe pro nomine reciproco *ille, ipſe*, ut Exod. 33. 15. Deut. 4. 37. "2 Sam. 17. 11. Latinè non commodè iiſdem verbis exprimi poteſt: igitur notionem, quæ "vocabulo Hebræo ſubeſſe videtur, cum ſequenti להאביד conjunctim indicavi." His verſion of the comma is: *Qui vero etiam rependat ſui oſoribus preſentiſſima pernicie:* which, in fact, is the ſame with mine and Jerom's: to which add that of Saadias בחצרתה. And, although, at preſent, I recollect not an inſtance of κατα προσωπον having the ſame meaning, it runs ſtrongly in my imagination, that ſuch inſtances are to be found. The Latin *impræſentiarum* and our *preſently* have a ſimilar etymon.—What convinces me that אל פניו or על פניו has here this meaning, is the paralleliſm in the following comma לא יאחר, *he will not procraſtinate:* but will *inſtantly repay him:* where the words אל פניו are repeated.

Ver. 20. *Hornets.* See Rem. on Exod. 23. 28.

CHAP. VIII.

Ver. 4. *YE have not, theſe forty years, worn tattered clothes,* &c. Heb. שמלתך לא בלתה מעליך—by our tranſlators rendered: "thy raiment waxed not old upon thee." So Sep. τα ἱματια σου ουκ επαλαιωθη απο σου—Vulg. *veſtimentum tuum, quo operiebaris, nequaquam vetuſtate deficit*—and ſo equivalently all the verſions down to Gr. Ven. incluſively: ἡ αναβολη σου ου πεπαλαιωται ανωθεν σου: by which tranſlations one would be led to imagine, what credulous Jews, and credulous Chriſtians, believe; that, during thoſe forty years, the clothes of the Iſraelites wore not out! This comes of too literal tranſlations. The obvious meaning of the original is, that they never were under the neceſſity of wearing tattered raiment. The note of Roſenmüller is here ſo pertinent, that I ſubjoin it below *. For the reſt, the Greek addition in Sep. τα ὑποδηματα σου ου κατετριβη απο σου, although wanting in all the copies, that I have ſeen, except the Roman edition, is yet ſo probable from the parallel place chap. 29. 5. that I am inclined to deem it a genuine part of the text †. I have tranſpoſed it, however, to the end of the colon, for the ſake of greater perſpicuity.

* "Senſus eſt, tantam fuiſſe Iſraelitis veſtium copiam, ut non opus eſſet eas laceratas a longo uſu tritas geri; non "defuiſſe iis ad amictum neceſſaria: id quod etiam hiſtoria docet. Habuerunt enim Iſraelitæ greges ovium, caprarum "et boum copioſos (Num. 32. 1. Deut. 3. 19.) unde ſatis magna lanæ et corii copia. Adfuerunt in populo textores "peritiſſimi, qui pro Aarone et tabernaculo nitidiſſima texerent vela et veſtimenta. Mulieres adeo peritæ erant artis "textoriæ (Exod. 35. 25.). Hinc non eſt opus, ut cum Judæorum magiſtris accipiamus, miraculo eſſe factum, ut "Iſraelitarum veſtes non ſolum non uſu adtritæ eſſent, ſed præterea etiam cum corpore eorum creſcerent. Bene hanc "inaptam et ridiculam opinionem ridet Hermannus von-der-hardt; qui ipſe et rectam illam a nobis allatam interpreta-"tionem propoſuit in *Ephemeridibus Philologicis* Diſcurſ. xii. et in *Epiſtolis annexis*, p. 340, &c."

† It is remarkable, that Onkelos renders the verſe thus: בסותך לא בליאת מנך ומסנך לא יחיפו דנן ארבעין שנין: *Thy raiment grew not old, and thy ſhoes were not torn,* &c. He ſeems to have read in his Heb. copy ונעלך לא בלתה with Sep. but without the following words of the preſent text, ורגלך לא בצקה; whereas Sep. read both commas.

Ver. 15.

Ver. 15. *Out of the flinty rock*—מצור החלמיש—Sep. εκ πετρας ακροτομου—Vulg. *de petra durissima*—Onk. משנרא תקיפא—Syr. מן באפא דטרנא—Saad. מן אלצואן אן אלצלד—Erp. מן אלצואן אלקוי. The last three, then, seem to have understood חלמיש to be *flint:* yet this is not certain. —Pers. has נארא, in Pol. rendered *marmoreo:* if with propriety, I doubt.—Gr. Ven. εκ πετρας της ακροτομου—almost all generical terms, applicable to any hard rock.—The Heb. word occurs only five times: out of which it is in our common version rendered four times *flint*; and once, in Job, *a rock*.—Etymology gives little assistance. Some derive it from חלם *to break*, and מוש *to recede*. "A hard stone (says Parkhurst) whose parts when broken *recede* or *fly off*."—But this surely is not a natural etymon.—Michaëlis has laboured to show, that חלמיש is a species of *granite*, or *porphyry*, which abounds about mounts Sinai and Horeb; and which Wallerius, in his *Mineralogical System*, tom. i. p. 408. thus describes: "Granites rubescens, "cum quartzo pingui semipellucido: granito rosso Italicè. Est saxum compositum e spato "scintillante rubente, quartzo pingui semipellucido, et particulis micaceis, in majoribus vel "minoribus quasi maculis accumulatis."

CHAP. IX.

Ver. 8. *AT Horeb even*, &c. The word *even* is here more significative than *also*; and better connects the text. I request the critical reader to compare, throughout the chapter, my version with the public one, and with the Hebrew and Samaritan texts.

Ver. 10. Delgado has justly remarked, that our translators ought not to have omitted the word *the* before *tables of stone*; as, in the next verse, they ought to have rendered "*the* forty days," &c. In both places Gr. Ven. has very properly the article: τα δυο πλακε—των τεσσαρακοντα ημερων. By Sep. however, it was omitted in both places.

Ver. 12. I have not ranked Onk. with the versions that read "thou:" although the Latin version in Pol. has *præcepisti*; because, independently of the punctuation, פקדת may be either the second or first person.

Ver. 15. The addition *up to the heavens*, εως του ουρανου, marked among the Var. Read. is only in the Rom. ed. of Sep. But it is also in the Coptic version: which shows that, if it be an interpolation, it is an antient one. Perhaps it will be found in some of Dr. Holmes's MSS. See P. P. ch. 4. 11.

Ver. 21. It is allowed that this verse, where it now stands in the text, is a manifest υστερον προτερον: for the burning of the golden calf happened priorly to what is related ver. 18, &c.—I have therefore, with little hesitation, placed it between verses 17 and 18. I have also ventured to transpose ver. 20 to the end of the chapter, after ver. 29.; and verses 22, 23, and 24, to the next chapter after ver. 11. I am persuaded, that the attentive reader will find this arrangement more clear and consistent than the common one: and as nothing is taken from the text, I trust such transpositions will be deemed pardonable. Those who think otherwise, need only to retranspose the said verses to their former seats.

Ib. *By a thorough grinding*—טחון היטב—Sep. καταλεσας σφοδρα—Vulg. *in frusta comminuens*—Onk. בשופינא יאות, in Pol. rendered *in pillo* (read *pilo*) *vehementer* *: but by Buxtorf *limâ*

* The translator of Targ. has also rendered the same word *in mortario*.

bene: and certainly the word שופינא in 1 Sam. 13. 21. cannot ſignify a peſtle.—Both Arabs have מברד, which undoubtedly ſignifies *a file.* But the Hebrew word, I think, will not admit that meaning: and Syr. Perſ. and Gr. Ven. all confirm the other ſignification. But in what ſort of a mill the golden calf was ground into duſt, it is impoſſible to determine. See the Rem. on Exod. 32. 20.

CHAP. X.

Ver. 6, 7. THE confuſion here, and the irreconciliability of the text with Numb. 33. are evident. I refer the reader to Kennicott's ſecond *Diſſertation on the State of the Hebrew Text,* and to his poſthumous Remarks, p. 74. Some of the difficulties are removed by the Sam copy; but not them all. Lilienthal and Hezel have done their beſt to produce ſomething like an agreement between the jarring paſſages; but to me they appear to have laboured in vain: and Roſenmüller, I find, is of the ſame opinion*.

CHAP. XI.

Ver. 10. *WITH the labour of your feet*—ברגלך—Sam. and 1 MS. רגליך—and ſo Sep. *τοις ποσσιν* —and Syr. ברגליכון—The reſt ſeem to have read in the ſingular. The writer is, with great probability, ſuppoſed to allude to an engine ſtill uſed in Egypt for the purpoſe of watering ground. It is thus deſcribed by Niebuhr: "Toute la machine conſiſte en une ſeule roue, qui "a huit rais attachés à l'axe, et quatre autres plus petits, qui ſont, deux à deux, vis-à-vis l'un "l'autre, de chaque côté de l'axe de la roue. Pour s'en ſervir on creuſe un puits, ſur lequel on "couche deux poutres, pour ſoutenir la machine; et à l'une des extrêmités de la roue on "couche, ſur les deux poutres, un morceau de bois, ſur lequel s'aſſied le travailleur. Il n'a "pas beſoin d'autre appui: mais il travaille à la fois des mains et des pieds †." *Voyage,* vol. i. p. 121.—I have, at Paris, ſeen windlaſſes of a ſimilar conſtruction, and worked after the ſame manner, to raiſe large ſtones to the top of a wall.

* "Quæ adfert Lilienthal, et repetit Hezel, ut hæc loca in concordiam redigantur, nimis artificioſa et contorta "videntur. In cod. quidem Sam. noſter hic locus optime convenit cum Numerorum loco: ſed quæ in iſto codice "leguntur *ſapiunt critici alicujus Samaritani manum emendatricem;* quum nulli codices Heb. nulla verſio antiqua, ne "Alexandrina quidem, noſtrum locum aliter legant.—Equidem putarem, cum Dathio, hos verſus plane non eſſe a Moſe, "ſed ab alia manu inſertos: prorſus enim alieni ſunt a Moſis conſilio, populum ad obedientiam legi divinæ preſtandam "adhortantis."—I cannot ſo readily allow, that the Sam. copy has been amended by the hand of criticiſm: it is more probable that the Hebrew copy has been vitiated, although at an early period; and infected all the antient tranſlations made from it.—The paſſage might perhaps come naturally in after ver. 11. eſpecially if we tranſpoſe verſes 22—24 of chap. 9. as I have done in my verſion.—On the whole, however, the text is better without verſes 6 and 7 of chap. 10. and I have on that account placed them below the text, among the Various Readings. † This is preciſely the *helix,* or *belinx,* of Philo; to which he compares an impertinent babbler, who talks without end, and confounds every thing—*ὡσπερ ἡ ἑλιξ, το ὑδρηλον οργανον, εχει· κατα γαρ μεσον αυτης γεγονασι βαθμοι τινες, ὡν ὁ γεωπονος, ὁταν εθελησῃ ποτισαι τας αρουρας, επιβαινει μεν, περιολισθαινει δ'αναγκαιως· ὑπερ δε του μη πιπτειν, συνεχως πλησιον ἐχυρου τινος ταις χερσι περιδρατται, ὁυ ενειλημμενος το ὁλον σωμα απῃωρηκεν αὐτου. Αντι μεν γαρ ποδων χερσιν, αντι δε χειρων ποσι χρηται· ἱσαται μεν γαρ επι χειρων, δι' ὡν εισιν αἱ πραξεις· πρατται δ'εν ποσιν, εφ' ὡν εικος ἱσασθαι!*—De Confuſ. Ling. tom. iii. p. 330, nov. edit.—See alſo Harmer's *Obſervations,* vol. ii. p. 236.

Ver. 21.

Ver. 21. *Like the days of the heavens, over the earth.*—כימי השמים על הארץ—Sep. καθως αἱ ἡμεραι του ουρανου επι της γης—Vulg. *Quamdiu cœlum imminet terræ:* which perfectly, although not literally, expreſſes the meaning of the original.

Ver. 24. *The further ſea* is the mediterranean; thus diſtinguiſhed from the *hither* ſea, or ſea of Sodom: *mare mortuum.*

CHAP. XII.

Ver. 5. *MAY chooſe to name for his own reſidence.* The Heb. is יבחר לשום את שמו שם לשכנו (Sam. לשים)—Lit. *may chooſe to put his name there, to inhabit it:* i. e. may chooſe to have called by his name—the place of his particular reſidence. The words, as Dathe obſerves, are to be explained by an equivalent phraſe, לשכן שמו שם, *ut nomen ejus ibi inhabitet*; that is, *ut ipſe ibi habitet.* "Quis enim neſcit nomen Dei eſſe idem quod Deus ipſe? Deus vero ibi "habitare dicitur, ubi ex voluntate ſua colitur."—For the reſt, the Syriac tranſlator divided the colon in a different manner, and took שכן for a noun: and this diviſion is followed by Dathe* and others. In the ſame verſe ובאת, in the preſent Heb. is evidently an error: read באתם with Sam. but not with all the verſions, as Dathe and Roſenmüller too raſhly affirm: for Arab. Erp. Perſ. and Gr. Ven. read in the ſingular. Their copies then had ובאת or ובאתה; moſt probably the latter, which is ſtill the reading of 3 MSS. and was more readily changed from ובאתם, than the other reading, from the ſimilarity of ה and ם in ſome MSS.

Ver. 6. Among the things which the Iſraelites are here ordered to bring to the place which the Lord ſhall chooſe for his reſidence, are the *firſtlings of their herds and flocks.* But theſe had been previouſly ordained to be given to the Levites as a part of their ſalary. Were they to receive them, only at the place, where the Lord ſhould chooſe to have his reſidence? This is by no means probable.—Were there then two ſorts of firſtlings, as well as two ſorts of tithes? So Michaëlis conjectures, and has laboured to prove in his *Moſaiſches Recht*, part. ii. ſect. 145. and part. iv. ſect. 192. According to him, the aſſignation made to the Levites was a Moſaical inſtitution; but that here mentioned a prior uſage, not abrogated by him: an uſage perhaps as old as the days of Jacob: and this idea is adopted by Dathe†: but neither have ſupported it with ſatisfactory arguments.—Delgado ſaw the difficulty, but obviates it in a manner to me not quite intelligible. His note on ver. 7. is: "This refers to ver. 6. The pronoun accuſative "*them* ſhould be added after the verb *eat*; and the nominative pronoun *ye* muſt be underſtood "partially; for *the heave-offering of your hands*, and *firſtling*, muſt refer to the prieſts. The *tithe* "doth not mean that which belongeth to the Levites; as that might be eaten any where; but

* Ad hoc ejus domicilium, ad eum conſulendum convenietis. But all the other ant. tranſlators conſidered לשכנו as a part of the former comma, and שכן as a verb: and the Sam. text is explicit, having לשכינו. † "Recte, ut "arbitror, illuſtr. Michaëlis ſtatuit, ut decimarum, ita quoque primogenitorum, duplex genus fuiſſe; alterum quod Deo "ſeu Levitis in partem ſalarii datum ſit, alterum quod ab Iſraelitis in epulis ſacrificalibus conſumeretur: illud quidem "Moſen in populo Iſraelitico primum inſtituiſſe, hoc vero ut ritum antiquum, *fortaſſe inde a Jacobo* ſervatum, inveniſſe, "neque abrogaſſe . . . Clericus ad ver. 17. exiſtimat, *primogenitum pecus* vocari *pinguiſſimum*, epulis ſacrificalibus conſe-"cratum, ex uſu hujus vocis בכור ſatis noto; quo nonnunquam pro *optimo* in ſuo genere dicitur. Sed, ut taceam, "tropicam vocum ſignificationem in legum interpretationem non facile eſſe admittendam, refellit hanc ſententiam "cap. 15. 19. ubi eadem lex repetita extat, ibique additur *omnes*, כל הבכור: ſed duriſſima lex fuiſſet, ſi *omnia* armenta "*pinguia* epulis ſacrificalibus debuiſſent inſumi."—A hard law, indeed!

"it

" it alludes to that mentioned in chap. xxiv. (it ſhould be xiv.) 22: and *your ſacrifices*, (which " means peace-offerings) for every individual that preſents it and his family."—It is my opinion, that the tithes and firſtlings here mentioned are not every tithe and firſtling, nor a ſecondary ſort of firſtlings and tithes: but the tithe of the tithes, and the choice, or firſt of the firſtlings. I draw this inference from Exod. 23. 19. where the Iſraelites are deſired to bring to the houſe of God not the firſtlings themſelves, but the *prime of the firſtlings*—ראשית בכורי—τας απαρχας των πρωτογεννηματων. To this indeed it may be objected, that in chap. 15. 19. " *every firſtling*, כל הבכור, is to be eaten before the Lord, at the place which he ſhall chooſe:" but we muſt ſuppoſe that the word כל, *every*, is here to be reſtricted to every one of the *prime* of firſtlings; as above explained: or allow that there is an inconſiſtency in the texts of Deuteronomy and Leviticus.

Ver. 15. *Nevertheleſs*, &c. The text is here brief, but ſufficiently intelligible. The words which I have put in Italics are evidently underſtood. The antelope and the deer were not to be offered in ſacrifice; but were clean animals.

Ver. 19. *Upon your land.*—על אדמתך, in both Heb. and Sam. copies, without any variety of lection: therefore badly rendered by our Engliſh tranſlators, *upon the earth*; properly corrected by Bate and Delgado. Our tranſlators here neglected their originals, to follow Sep. and Vulg. επι της γης—*in terra*. Syr. has likewiſe בארעא; but all the other ant. verſions expreſs the Heb. but none better than Saadias—פי בלדך *in thine own fixt reſidence*—Gr. Ven. επι της γης σου.—Hence, I think, it may be inferred, that the Jews, in their ſtate of exile, are not tied down to the obſervation of this precept.

Ver. 28. *With which I now charge thee.* The word *now*, or *to-day*, היום, is in Sam. the Syr. verſion, and one of Kennicott's MSS.: one of De Roſſi's had this ſame reading at firſt, in the margin. Two copies of Onkelos agree. See De Roſſi, vol. ii. p. 46.

CHAP. XIII.

THE firſt verſe of this chapter, in the common diviſion of the Hebrew text, evidently belongs to the preceding chapter: and ſo it is placed in the Polyglott; conformably to Sam. and moſt of the antient verſions.

Ver. 10. *But ſhall ſurely denounce him.* I have followed Sep. αναγγελλων αναγγελεις περι αυτου, as being more agreeable to the context, and the reaſon of the thing. It was not the province of the denouncer to kill the guilty perſon: the ſentence of the judge was to be obtained for that purpoſe. The Septuagint, then, moſt probably read in their copy הגד תגידנו inſtead of הרג תהרגנו. Yet Sam. and all the other verſions read as Heb. which may be rendered: *Thou ſhalt ſurely let him be ſlain.*

Ver. 15. *Even its cattle with the edge of the ſword*—ואת בהמתה לפי חרב. The comma is wanting in Sep. and indeed it ſeems ſuperfluous: for every thing in a city, כל אשר בה, muſt contain its cattle. In Vulg. there is only *uſque ad pecora:* but he may have read in his copy as we now do, as he often abridges his original, and ſometimes expands it.

CHAP.

CHAP. XIV.

Ver. 4, 5. THE firſt four names of animals allowed to be eaten are certain; the reſt doubtful. What I render the *antelope*, צבי, is by Sep. rendered δορκας—by Vulg. *caprea*—by Michaëlis *reh*—by Dathe *caprea*—by Roſenmüller *antilope dorcas*.

The hart-beeſt—יחמור—Sep. βουβαλος*—Vulg. *bubalus*—Michaëlis retains the Heb. word *jachmur*—Dathe *jachmar*. There is little doubt but it is the ſame animal which the Arabs ſtill call by the ſame name. It is frequent about the Euphrates, and is a ſpecies of the *gazelle*.—See Bochart. Hieroz. p. i. lib. iii. c. 22.

The goat-deer—אקו—Sep. τραγελαφος—Vulg. *tragelaphus*†—Michaëlis *ſteinbock*—Dathe *tragelaphus*.

The ſpring-bok—דישון—Sep. πυγαργος—Vulg. *pygargus*—Michaëlis and Dathe *diſchon*, the Heb. word.

The wood-goat—תאו—Sam. תאי—Sep. ορυξ—Vulg. *oryx*—Michaëlis *büffeloſchſe*—Dathe *bubalus*—and our traveller Shaw is of the ſame opinion.

The camelopard—זמר—Sep. καμηλοπαρδαλις—Vulg. *camelopardalus*—Michaëlis and Dathe retain the Heb. word *ſamar* or *ſemer*—We would write *zamer*.

I have not given the other antient verſions, becauſe they are moſtly as doubtful as the original terms. The reader may ſee them in Bochart, or in Michaëlis *Supplementa* ad Lex. Heb. I ſhall only give the ſix names as they are in the Greek of Venice, as they are yet leſs known than the others. Here they are: Δορκας—αιξ αγρια—τραγος—μονοκερως—αγριοβους—ζυραμφις.

Ver. 7. *A divided cloven hoof*—מפריסי הפרסה השסועה. The word השסועה is wanting in the Sam. copy; nor was it read, it would appear, by Saadias; nor, perhaps, by Jerom; who has only *et ungulum non findunt*. But it was read by all the other tranſlators.

Ver. 8—12. See the Rem. on Leviticus 11.

Ver. 13. *And gledes*—הדיה. But the word is wanting in Sam. and in 4 MSS. as well as in the P. P. Levit. 11. 14. Bochart imagined that it had been dropt out of the text of Leviticus, from its contiguity to a ſimilar word האיה. It is rendered by Sep. ικτιν or ικτινος‡—by Vulg. *milvus*. The three names in Gr. Ven. are ιβις—κιττα—κολιος.

Ver. 16. *The ibis*—השלך. I have followed the order of the Sam. copy, which is that of P. P. Levit. 11. 17. and of one (5) of Kennicott's MSS. here. It is of very little importance.—For the reſt ſee the Rem. on Leviticus.

* So Compl. Ald. Alex. with Copt. and the Ox. and Glaſg. MSS. The word is wanting in Sep. Rom. † I know not what induced Roſenmüller to ſay: "Alexandrini et Vulgatus vocabulum אקו in verſione prorſus omiſerunt." It is true that there is nothing for it in the Roman edition; any more than for יחמור: but all the other editions, with the Oxford, Glaſgow, Canon. and the Ambroſian Uncial MSS. have τραγελαφον—and ſo the Coptic verſion: ſo that there is no doubt of this being the genuine reading of Sep. The Vulgate, in all the copies, has *tragelaphus*; which is only the Greek word latinized. ‡ By Roſenmüller it is ſaid to be omitted by Sep. But this, I think, is a miſtake. It is true, that in the 4 printed editions there is wanting one name; but that name, I think, correſponds with the Heb. ראה; for which in the Oxford MS. there is ιξον, as in the Vulg. *ixion*. So that, admitting this to be genuine, there are in ver. 13. three names correſponding with the three Hebrew names: and that correſponding with הדיה will be ικτινον, or, as other copies, ικτινα.

CHAP.

CHAP. XV.

Ver. 1, 2, &c. MICHAELIS, in the third part of his *Moſaical Juriſprudence*, ſect. 157. has laboured to prove that this releaſe was only a reſpite during the ſabbatical year; and that the creditor might the next year demand what was due to him: and his ideas have been adopted by Dathe and Roſenmüller. I cannot ſee how the text can bear this interpretation. I believe it was a real and abſolute releaſe; although it ſeems, from ver. 4. to be reſtricted to the poorer ſort only. From the rich, I apprehend, the debt might be demanded *.

Ver. 14. *Ye ſhall load them with gifts*—העניק תעניק לו—by Montanus rendered, *torquem dando, torquem dabis ei:* a very intelligible verſion, ſurely! Our tranſlators did well to abandon the letter here. They render: "Thou ſhalt furniſh him liberally:" by which the ſenſe is certainly expreſſed, but not the force of the Hebrew words; which indeed are not eaſily rendered into any modern tongue. The antients have generally metaphraſed them. Sep. εφοδιον εφοδιασεις αυτον—Vulg. *ſed dabis viaticum*—Onk. אפרשא תפריש ליה—Syr. פרוש והב לה—Saad. צלה בצלה—Erp. תעביא תעביה, *load him well.* And ſo Tharg. Bab. הענק מרחדא תרחדון ליה: by Buxtorf, after ſome Heb. ſcholiaſt, rendered, *exhilarando exhilarabitis eum*—in Pol. *onorando onorabitis eum.* But in this tranſlation the word הענק is not expreſſed; and a more literal verſion would be, *collum ei onorando onorabitis:* and this, I have no doubt, is the true meaning of the Hebrew: Ye ſhall lay upon his neck, or ſhoulders, as great a load as it will bear: or, as I have rendered, "ye ſhall load him with gifts."

Ver. 17. *And in like manner ſhall ye treat your female ſlaves.* It is a Jewiſh tradition, according to Delgado, that the female ſlave never had her ear bored; and that, conſequently, "the whole paragraph ſpeaks only of the law of the man ſervant; and the woman ſervant in "ver. 12. is only mentioned to take notice, that ſhe was to be furniſhed liberally, as in ver. 14. "(to which theſe words refer) as well as the man ſervant." All this may be a Jewiſh tradition; but it appears not in the *bond.*

Ver. 18. *Seeing they have, in ſerving you ſix years, been doubly worth an hired ſervant.* The Heb. is: כי משנה שכר שכיר עבדך שש שנים—Sep. ὁτι επετειον μισθον του μισθωτου εδουλευσε σοι ἐξ ετη—*quoniam juxta mercedem mercenarii per ſex annos ſervivit tibi*; neither of which ſeems to expreſs the whole meaning of the original. Nor is it indeed eaſy to aſcertain that meaning. The opinion of ſome Jewiſh interpreters, we learn from Jarhi, was, that the ſlave wrought for his maſter day and night, which an hired ſervant did not. But what was his nocturnal labour? Why, he lay with a female ſlave, to get young ſlaves for his maſter †.—Aben Ezrah imagines

* Delgado, however, is of a different opinion, which is probably that of his brethren of the preſent day. He renders the words ver. 4. אפס כי לא יהיה בך אביון, *although there ſhould be no poor among you*—with the following note: "The Engliſh tranſlation implieth, that when there are no poor this law is ſuſpended: which is not the caſe: for, if a "rich man chooſeth to avail himſelf of this law, he hath a right ſo to do: nay more, no perſon might make a demand "on another after the commencement of this year: and ſhould he offer to pay, the creditor was to tell him: *I releaſe it:* "nor could he take it unleſs the debtor ſaid: *Notwithſtanding this, I bid you take it.* So that this means, that this law "ſhould be in force, although there were no poor in the land."—In this interpretation I cannot poſſibly acquieſce. The Hebrew, in my opinion, will not bear ſuch a meaning.

† "Hinc dicunt: Servus Hebræus ſervit tam die quam "nocte; et hoc eſt duplum ejus, quo mercenarii diurni ſerviunt. Sed quænam eſt ſervitus nocturna? Dominus ejus "tradit ei ancillam Chanaanæam, cujus liberi ſunt illius domini." Jarhi ex verſ. Breithaupti, vol. i. p. 1390.

that

that the common term of a hired ſervant was three years, which he infers from Iſaiah xvi. 14. So that the ſlave, who ſerved ſix years, did the double ſervice of a mercenary: and this, I confeſs, is the moſt plauſible explanation that I have met with. Le Clerc and Roſenmüller give indeed a more ſimple one: "eandem operam tibi navavit per ſexennium, quam duo mercenarii "navaſſent; et quod fecit, ad id præſtandum duobus mercenariis opus fuiſſet: ac reverâ durior "eſt conditio ſervi quam mercenarii, et major ab eo labor exigitur."

Ver. 20. *Every male firſtling*, &c. I have elſewhere obſerved, that the word *every*, כל, muſt be here reſtrained to the prime of the firſtlings; that is, to the ſingle firſt-born of each kind: not to every firſt-born of every individual: otherwiſe the paſſage would claſh with Numb. 18. 18. which, according to my explanation, it does not. See the Rem. on ch. 12.

CHAP. XVI.

Ver. 2. *WITH other offerings*. Theſe words, which in my verſion I have put in Italics, are a neceſſary ſupplement. Delgado ſupplies *beſides*, which comes to the ſame. It is evident that not only the paſchal lamb but other paſchal offerings are here included. The judicious Saadias has very properly ſupplied ומעה, *and with it*.

Ver. 8. *A feſtival to the Lord*—עצרת ליהוה—Sep. ἑορτη κυριῳ—Vulg. *collecta eſt Domini:* by the Douay tranſlators rendered, "the collection of our Lord," without any note to explain its meaning—and ſo the French of Frizon, *la collecte du Seigneur:* but Saçi and Calmet more judiciouſly paraphraſe: "parceque ce ſera le jour de l'aſſemblée ſolemnelle inſtituée en l'hon-"neur du Seigneur." The laſt German tranſlators of the Vulgate, more literally: "eine "verſammlung."—Onk. כניש—Syr. כנושיא—both denoting *an aſſembly*—and ſo equivalently Tharg. and Arab. Erp.—Saad. מכתא, *an abiding*, at the ſanctuary—Sam. ver. חג, of the ſame import with the Greek ἑορτη—Perſ. retains the Heb. word—and Gr. Ven. has, as in Leviticus, κωλυμη. So much for the antients.——Of modern verſions, I ſhall notice only that of our Engliſh tranſlators. Our common verſion has, after the Genevans, "a ſolemn aſſembly;" and in the margin *reſtraint*. Our older verſions have "gathering together"—Purver, "a ſolemn day"—Bate follows the common verſion: but Delgado would have us render, *a day of detention from work*; and this is the explication of Jarhi * and other Rabbins. Delgado's note is: "In ver. 7. "he bids them go to their tents, the morning after the paſſover: how, then, can this mean "*a ſolemn aſſembly?* The Hebrew word means *deſertion from work* †." But in the ſuppoſition that they went home, on the morning after the paſchal ſacrifice, they might return on the ſeventh day to hold *an aſſembly to the Lord:* not to ſay that, according to ſome interpreters, the morning here mentioned is the morning after the ſeventh day; which I think hardly probable ‡.

In my verſion of Levit. 23. 36. I have rendered it, with our common verſion, *an aſſembly day:* but, as I am not ſure if the people actually aſſembled on that day, I have here followed Sep. and the Samaritan verſion; and uſed a general term, which is ſuited to either hypotheſis: for they might keep *a feſtival to the Lord*, either at home or at the ſanctuary. Were I to draw

* Who gives, however, another: namely, *an aſſembly.* † But if it ſignified, in itſelf, *a deſertion from work*; the next comma would be ſuperfluous. ‡ Michaëlis's verſion is "ein hocher feſtag Jehova." Dathe's, *dies ſacer Jovæ.*

the meaning of the Heb. term from the common ſignification of its radical form, I would render it *a ſhutting-up day: dies feriata.*—For the reſt, of the two additions of "any," כל, and "ſervile," עבדה, which are in the Sam. copy; the former is ſupported by ſeveral Hebrew MSS. and by Sep. and Syr.: the latter by both Sam. verſions; and by Sep. although they paraphraſe thus: πλην οσα ποιηθησεται ψυχη.

Ver. 10. Archbiſhop Secker very properly bids us efface the words in Italic in our common verſion of this verſe: *unto the Lord thy God.* They are evidently a ſuperfluous eke.

Ver. 13. *The feſtival of booths,* or *tabernacles,* is thus kept by the Jews of Aleppo. "The "tabernacles are variouſly conſtructed, and diſpoſed in different ſituations, according to the ſize "and other conveniences of the houſe. They are ſometimes placed upon the ſmall terraces in "the front of the upper rooms; but moſt commonly in the court-yards: ſometimes on the flat "tops of houſes. The ordinary method of building them is by faſtening to the corners of a "wooden *divan* four ſlender erect poſts; which ſerve to ſupport on all ſides a reticulated work "of green reeds; a ſmall place only in the front being left for the entrance. This work on the "outſide is covered with freſh myrtle; and is hung on the inſide with chintz or burdet hang-"ings. The roof is thatched with reeds not ſtript of their leaves: and the beſt cuſhions and "carpets are employed to dreſs the divan. Theſe divans have the advantage of being eaſily "moved; and two or more may be joined together. In ſome of the principal houſes a perma-"nent wooden *kiaſk*, built upon a ſtone *muſtaby*, in the middle of the court, is made to ſerve "the purpoſe; which, being already latticed, is eaſily covered with reeds and myrtle branches. "There is ſtill another method uſed, in order to avoid the litter of withered leaves. This is "by erecting a temporary booth, conſiſting of ſlight poſts, papered over, and wreathed from top "to bottom with flakes of cotton: hangings ſupply the place of walls; and the whole is rooſed "with mats." Ruſſel's Aleppo, vol. ii. p. 69.

CHAP. XVII.

Ver. 3. *WHICH I have forbidden.* The Heb. hath, "which I have not commanded"—אשר לא צויתי. But this is a common *meiotical* Hebraiſm, which denotes ſtrict prohibition; and ought to be rendered prohibitively.

Ver. 9. *Who will inquire, and make known to you.* The preſent Heb. has ודרשת והגידו לך, *thou ſhalt inquire, and they will make known to thee:* or, as elegantly Dathe: *Hos conſulite; hi de jure vobis reſpondebunt.* I have followed the Sam. lection ודרשו; which was that of Sep. και εκζητησαντες αναγγελουσι σοι. But all the other verſions down to Gr. Ven. incluſively read in the ſecond perſon.

CHAP. XVIII.

Ver. 3. *A SHOULDER, the two cheeks, and the maw*—Heb. הזרוע והלחיים והקבה—Sep. τον βραχιονα, και τα σιαγονια, και το ενυστρον*—Vulg. has only *armum et ventriculum:* but all the other

* So alſo Joſephus: but Philo ηνυστρον, and ſo it is written in Pollux: but Gr. Ven. has here ενυστρον; and agrees alſo in the other terms with Sep.

verſions

verſions have three different terms. Delgado obſerves, "that Scripture explains in one place "what is omitted in another: ſo that the two *cheeks* and the *maw*, mentioned here, may be "added in Levit. 7. 34. and the *breaſt* mentioned there may be underſtood here." But this is ſurely an odd manner of *adding*, and *underſtanding*. I rather think that this is a diſtinct precept; as I have ſaid in my Explanatory Note.

Ver. 8. *He ſhall eat.* The preſent Heb. followed by moſt of the antient verſions, has יאכלו, *they ſhall eat:* but preferable, in my opinion, is the reading of Sam. יאכל, followed by Sep. φαγεται. For the reſt, Sep. ſeem to have read מחלק inſtead of כחלק, as they render μεριδα μεμερισμενην. The meaning of the laſt comma of this verſe, לבד ממכריו על האבות, is conteſted. Aben-Ezrah, followed by our Engliſh tranſlators, gives to לבד its common ſignification *beſide:* "but I cannot (ſays Delgado) ſay that I approve of this explanation: for, how could it be ſup-"poſed, that the eating of the ſacrifice ſhould affect his patrimony? It ſhould be obſerved, that "לבד means *except* as well as *beſides*; and ſo Raſchy * renders it: and this refers to a mutual "agreement, the prieſts made among themſelves, to be divided into claſſes, and to ſerve weekly "by turns; and that claſs, whoſe turn it was to be left out, is hereby excluded from it: and, "as it was an agreement with their own conſent, Scripture terms it by the denomination of a "*ſale*, as they had a better ſhare of it when it was their turn to ſerve, they being then leſs in "number on that account."—Hence he tranſlates, *except their condeſcenſions by the fathers.* I confeſs I underſtand not this: nor can I ſee how the words of the text will bear ſuch a meaning.—But let us ſee how the antients underſtood it. Sep. πλην της πρασεως † της κατα πατριαν—Aquila πλην των πρασεων αυτου επι τους πατερας—Sym. πλην της κτησεως ἑκαστος (read ἑκαστου) της κατα της πατριας—Vulg. *excepto eo, quod in urbe ſua ex paterna ei ſucceſſione debetur:* where the word *excepto* has evidently the ſame meaning with *præter*.—Onk. and the Thargum of Jonathan paraphraſe much to the purport of Raſhi, Jarhi, and Delgado—Syr. moſt briefly and literally, but not very intelligibly, סטר מן זבנא דאבהא—Saad. מלחאל מא אתבתה אלאבא מן אלנוב: *beſide what the fathers have ordained concerning ſucceſſion*; the paraphraſe of a text, which he was probably at a loſs to underſtand—Erp. very literally תבאת אלאבא הלאה—Perſ. favours the common interpretation of the Rabbins—and Gr. Ven. has επι των πρασεων αυτου επι των πατερων. —All theſe verſions, the intelligent reader will perceive, are but ſo many various conjectures, or verbal renderings, which have no explicit meaning: and, indeed, it is hard to give a clear and explicit meaning out of the Hebrew words. I have rendered them as literally as I could, and in the ſignification which I deemed the moſt probable. I ſubjoin Roſenmüller's ſcholium: "Per *venditiones* intelligi debent poſſeſſiones venales, poſſeſſiones eæ quæ parentum fuerunt; "ob idque et ab iis vendi poterant. Etſi enim fundos ad agriculturam, vineas, oliveta Levitæ "non poſſiderent, habebant tamen urbes ſuas, in quibus domos poſſidere poterant, greges et "armenta aliaque mobilia: itemque juxta urbem agros compaſcuos ad jumentorum pabula; "quæ omnia ſucceſſione ad poſteros tranſibant."—The verſion of Dathe is: *præter vendita a ſe de bonis paternis*—That of Michaëlis: "das ungerechnet, was er noch als familien-deputat "verkaufen kann."

* He might have added Jarhi; who alſo talks of a ſort of convention between the prieſts: "Et vendiderunt alter "alteri (dicendo) *Tolle tu ſabbatum tuum, et ego tollam ſabbatum meum.*" † The Complutenſian adds αυτου: but it was not read by Auſtin in the old Ital. verſion. See Sabatier.

Ver. 10. *A fortune-teller*—קסם קסמים—Sep. *μαντευομενος μαντειαν*—Vulg. *qui ariolos ſciſcitetur*—Onk. and Tharg. Chaldaize the Heb. words—Syr. קצם קצמא, equivalent terms—and ſo alſo Sam ver.—Saad. מנגם תנגימאת, *an aſtrologer*—Arab. Erp. מי יסתפל אסתפאלא, *qui auguratur augurium*—Gr. Ven. *μαντευων μαντειας*—Thus the antients.

Michaëlis thought it means an *haruſpex*, who takes omens from the entrails of animals, and renders accordingly "der aus den engeweiden der thiere wahrſaget"—Dathe, *qui ſortilegia exerceat*.—Roſenmüller is of opinion, that it denotes that ſort of divination which the Greeks called *βελομαντια*; which, as we learn from Tacitus, was in uſe alſo among the Germans. "Illud "ipſum autem ſortilegium apud Arabes quoque uſitatum fuiſſe docet nos Pocokius, in *Specim.* "*Hiſt. Arab.* p. 328, 329. Ut dum aliquid obeundum ſit magni momenti, tres ſagittas includant "vaſculo; quarum uni inſcriptum אמני רבי, *juſſit me Dominus*; alteri נהאני רבי, *prohibuit me* "*Dominus*; tertia nulla nota fuerit inſignita. Extrahentibus ſagittas, ſi occurreret quæ juberet, "rem aggreſſos ſuperſtitioſos; ſi quæ vetaret, quieviſſe; ſi *αγρεμμενος*, repetiiſſe, donec prodiret "quæ vel interdiceret vel præciperet. Hujus ſortilegii veſtigium deprehendimus in ipſa radice "קסם, nam Arabibus in conjug. 1oma eſt *voluit ut partitio fieret* ſagittarum jactu." Roſenmüller *in loc.* I deemed it better to uſe a general term: as the radical meaning of נסם is not eaſily aſcertainable.

Ib. *An augur*—מעונן—by Sep. rendered *κληδονιζομενος*—by Vulg. *qui obſervet ſomnia*. The Heb. word ſeems evidently to denote one who takes auguries from the clouds. See the Remark on Levit. 19. 26.

Ib. *A diviner*—מנחש. It ſeems to denote one who divines by means of ſerpents*.—Sep. however have a general term: *οιωνιζομενος*—Vulg. *qui obſervet auguria*—Dathe, *augur*—Roſenmüller, *auſpex*.

Ib. *A ſorcerer*—מכשף—Sep. *φαρμακος*—Vulg. *maleficus*—Dathe, *veneficus*. The word is, with ſome probability, ſuppoſed to denote that ſort of ſorcery which faſcinates the eyes: hence Michaëlis renders: "Der mondfinſterniſſen machen will."—Roſenmüller on Exod. 7. 11. thinks it is to be derived from the Arabic חסף, *abſcondit*; and would render *rerum arcanarum peritus*. But none of the antients favour this verſion: and *a ſorcerer*, on the whole, ſeems to be the moſt eligible term.—The laſt three words in this verſe are in Gr. Ven. rendered *χρησμωδων—επαοδων—γοητευων*.

Ver. 11. *An inchanter*—חבר חבר—by Montanus rendered *jungens junctionem*: that is, according to ſome Jewiſh interpreters, either *joining* together certain incantatory verſes, or *collecting* a certain number of ſerpents. The latter idea pleaſed Michaëlis and Dathe. But Roſenmüller ſends us to the Arab ſignification of חבר, *ſcivit, peritus fuit*. I doubt, however, if this be not but a ſecondary meaning of the word, like the Latin *lego*, in the ſenſe of *reading*. I would ſtick to the common meaning of חבר, and ſay that חבר חבר was one who compoſed magical *ſpells* or *incantations*†; which are ſometimes called alſo *ligaments*; eſpecially when they are employed to prevent connubial enjoyments. It is remarkable that the Sam. verſion has two words that literally denote *a tier of ligaments*; אסר אסרים. The complaint of impotency from this cauſe is ſtill a common complaint in Arabia. Sec Niebuhr, and other travellers into the Eaſt.

* And ſo Michaëlis renders: "Der aus ſchlangen wahrſaget." † The Septuagint verſion is: *επαειδων επαοιδην*—Vulg. *incantator*—Gr. Ven. *φαρμακευων φαρμακειαν*.

Ib.

Ib. *A necromancer*—שאל אוב—by Montanus rendered *interrogans Pythonem*—Sep. and Gr. Ven. εγγαςριμυθος—Vulg. *qui Pythones conſultat:* followed by Dathe, *conſulens pythones.*—So our common verſion, "a conſulter with familiar ſpirits."—But it would appear from 1 Sam. 28. 8 and 19. that אוב was *a necromancer.* Yet, as דרש אל המתים ſeems to denote that more properly, perhaps it were better to render *ventriloquiſt* with Sep. In my Explan. Note I have ſaid, that I take the latter term, *a conſulter of the dead,* to be only an interpretation of the former: but the intervention of another word, ידעי, which has unaccountably been omitted in my verſion, makes this ſuppoſition untenable. Pleaſe then to reform my tranſlation of ver. 11. thus: "Or an inchanter, or a pythoniſt, or a wizard, or a conſulter of the dead,"—or "necro-"mancer."

Ver. 15. *A prophet like me*—נביא כמני. The words *like me* are not to be conſidered as a compariſon of parity between Moſes and his ſucceſſors; but that *they, as well as he,* were to be raiſed by God out of their own people and nation. For the reſt, although the writers of the New Teſtament have accommodated this paſſage to Jeſus Chriſt; yet the ſeries of Moſes's ſpeech cannot be reconciled with ſuch an interpretation; unleſs in a figurative and myſtical meaning. The reaſoning of Dathe is ſo juſt, that I cannot help laying it before my readers: "Sub *hoc propheta* non unus aliquis intelligendus, ſed prophetæ in genere omnes, quos Deus "ſequentibus temporibus voluntatis ſuæ interpretes ad Iſraelitas ſit miſſurus: quem ſenſum, "quantum ego quidem intelligo, contextus planè docet. 1. Interdixit Moſes, ver. præcedente, "populo, ne hariolos, &c. adiret: rationem addit, in hoc ver. quod Deus eis ex ſua gente "prophetas ſuæ voluntatis interpretes perpetuo mittere vellet. 2. Nulla eſſet vis in verbis "Moſis ad cavendam illam ſuperſtitionem, niſi promittat Meſſiam ſtatim poſt mortem ſuam "venturum*. 3. Nexus cum ver. 20, 21, 22, in quibus docetur qua ratione ab illis veris Dei "prophetis pſeudoprophetæ ſint diſcernendi.—Perperam nonnulli interpretes urgent illud כמוני "*ſicuti ego*; cum negetur Deut. 35. 10. prophetam Moſi ſimilem extitiſſe. Malè enim ab eis "illud כמוני extenditur ad omnes Moſis prærogativas. Propheta Moſi ſimilis intelligitur talis, "cui Deus ſuam voluntatem patefaciat, et qui eam ad populum ſumma fide referat, uti Moſes "hactenus fecerat." This mode of explaining and limiting the meaning of כמוני is alſo urged by Delgado: but I think it more probable, as I have already ſaid, that the compariſon is in the ſucceeding prophets being, like Moſes, of the Iſraelitic nation. The conſtruction of the words appears to me to point to that meaning. Moſes ſeems to ſay: The Lord will raiſe up to you a prophet out of your own brethren, *as I am:* and perhaps כמוני would be better ſo rendered. Montanus's moſt literal verſion is: *Prophetam, ex interiori tuo et ex fratribus tuis ſicut ego, ſuſcitabit tibi Dominus.*—On the whole, then, I am ſtrongly inclined to believe that the compariſon lies purely in this: Conſult not the ſoothſayers and fortune-tellers of the neighbouring nations, which is abominable to the Lord, but apply to prophets of your own nation, ſuch as I am.—Hence, when Ahaziah ſent to conſult the god of Ekron about the iſſue of his ſickneſs, Elias ſays: "Is it for want of a God in Iſrael, that ye are going to conſult Beelzebub, the god of

* Indeed, it is hard to conceive, how any perſon, who but runs and reads, can find here the promiſe of a diſtant prophet, or Meſſiah. For, as Roſenmüller obſerves, what ſort of argument would this be? Conſult not augurs and fortune-tellers, &c. for the Lord your God will *ſome hundred years after my death* raiſe up a prophet, like me, to whom ye ſhall hearken.

"Ekron?"—To obviate the objection to his interpretation, which might be drawn from Acts 3. 23. and 7. 37. Dathe continues thus: "Cum hac explicatione citatio hujus loci in "N. Teſtamento, et applicatio ejus ad Meſſiam bene poteſt conciliari, ſi teneamus, id quod "adeo Calovius contra Grotium diſputans conceſſit, multa Vet. Teſtamenti loca præter ſenſum "proximè intentum, (literalem vocant) habere quoque ſenſum ſublimiorem. Igitur hæc verba "maximè propriè de Meſſia poſſunt intelligi, et in eo ſunt impleta: quippe ille fuit veriſſimus "ille a Deo miſſus propheta ex populo Judaico, cujus contemptum quoque Deus ſeverè puniit." —Roſenmüller, who adopts the reſt of Dathe's annotation, is wiſely ſilent on this part of it. Whatever were the ultimate views of Providence, and however well the words may be accommodated to Jeſus Chriſt, I believe Moſes never thought of ſuch an accommodation.

CHAP. XIX.

NOTHING could be wiſer than the regulations contained in this chapter; in which there occurs hardly any grammatical difficulty. See Rem. on Numbers, ch. 25.—The three cities of refuge here mentioned are not, according to Delgado, the ſame with thoſe mentioned in ch. 4. 41. but cities "that were never ſet apart as yet, though they will be at the future reſto-"ration."

CHAP. XX.

Ver. 4. *AND to ſave you.* The copulative is wanting in the preſent Heb. which has only לְהוֹשִׁיעַ: but the Sam. text and verſion, with Sep.* Syr. and Saad. have the copulative וּלְהוֹשִׁיעַ; which I have followed in my verſion.

Ver. 15. Although the addition in this verſe, "whoſe land," &c. be only in Sep. and Vulg. I have no doubt of its having originally ſtood in the text. The comma has been dropt out, in tranſcribing, from its contiguity to the repetition in the beginning of next verſe.—The ſame has happened to the copies of Sep. with reſpect to the repetition; which is wanting in the Vatican and ſome other MSS. as the preceding comma is wanting in Ald. Comp. and Alex.

Ver. 19. This is confeſſedly a moſt difficult paſſage, and has accordingly been variouſly interpreted. The Heb. is כִּי תָצוּר אֶל † עִיר יָמִים רַבִּים לְהִלָּחֶם עָלֶיהָ לְתָפְשָׂהּ לֹא תַשְׁחִית אֶת עֵצָהּ לִנְדֹּחַ עָלָיו גַּרְזֶן כִּי מִמֶּנּוּ תֹאכֵל וְאֹתוֹ לֹא תִכְרֹת || כִּי הָאָדָם עֵץ הַשָּׂדֶה לָבוֹא מִפָּנֶיךָ בַּמָּצוֹר; by Montanus literally rendered: *Cum coarctaveris civitatem diebus multis pugnando ſuper eam ad captandum eam, non corrumpes lignum ejus impellendo ſuper illud ſecurim; quia ex illo comedes, et illud non ſuccides: quia homo, lignum agri, ad veniendum a faciebus tuis in coarctationem*—by our laſt Engliſh tranſlators: "When thou ſhalt beſiege a city a long time, in making war againſt it, to take it; "thou ſhalt not deſtroy the trees thereof, by forcing an axe againſt them: for thou mayeſt eat "of them, and thou ſhalt not cut them down (for the tree of the field *is* man's *life*) to employ

* That is, Ald. Comp. Alex. with the Oxford and Glaſg. MSS. And ſo read Copt. and Auſtin in the ant. Italic. The Roman ed. has not the copulative.—For the reſt, there is here another var. reading in the copies of Sep.—Ald. and Comp. with the Oxford MS. have διασωσει: and ſo read Auſtin: but Alex. and Glaſg. have the true reading, και διασωσαι. So Copt. † Sam. על. || Sam. תכרית.

"them

"them in the ſiege*."—The whole difficulty lies in theſe few words: כי האדם עץ השדה לבוא מפניך במצור—rendered by Sep. μη ανθρωπος το ξυλον το εν τῳ αγρῳ, εισελθειν απο προσωπου σου εις τον χαρακα—Vulg. *Quoniam lignum eſt, et non homo; nec poteſt bellantium contra te augere numerum.* —Equivalent is the verſion of Onkelos, and in ſome meaſure that of Syr. Tharg. both Arabs, Perſ. and Gr. Ven. whoſe verſion is επει αρ' ανθρωπος το ξυλον του αγρου, ὡς αφικοιτο απο προσωπου σου εις την πολιορκιαν.——To come now to the moderns: Le Clerc, with ſome prior commentators (who may be ſeen in Pole), took the prefix ה before אדם to be an interrogative; and renders "nam an arbor agri homo eſt?" for which he is, as uſual, reproved by Houbigant, who, perhaps too roundly, aſſerts that an interrogative ה after כי is repugnant to the genius of the Hebrew language. He adds, that the Maſoretes themſelves were of his opinion; as they point with a *kametz*, not with a *kateph-patach*. But Houbigant, in my apprehenſion, is wrong, when he at the ſame time aſſerts that the antients inſtead of האדם muſt have read לא האדם; becauſe they render with a negative particle. It is well known that they often changed, and properly changed, the interrogative into a negative: and, in fact, *Is man a tree?* is, in Hebrew phraſeology, equipollent to *Man is not a tree.*—But there is a greater objection againſt Le Clerc's, and even Houbigant's verſion †. The reaſon aſſigned by Moſes, why fruit-trees ſhould not be cut down, is not, leſt they ſhould become *men*, and join the beſieged (a frigid puerile conceit); but merely becauſe they *are* fruit-trees, which afford food to man. The parentheſis then, in queſtion, muſt be explained by the context, that precedes and follows it: and both lead us to ſeek the meaning which was adopted by James's tranſlators, and which I have followed in my verſion: only, for the ſake of perſpicuity, I have, with the Genevans, put the parentheſis at the end of the verſe; where, in Engliſh, it ought to be. So elegantly Dathe, after Frommann: *Igitur eas ne ſuccidite, ut illis ad obſidionem utamini: hominum enim uſui a Deo deſtinatæ ſunt.*— In my Explan. Note I have obſerved, that if the words עץ השדה (trees of the field) denote only *barren*, or rather *foreſt*, trees, the explication of Tympius, adopted by Roſenmüller §, would be extremely probable, taken by itſelf: but with what precedes and follows it is not in my opinion reconcileable.—The only objection that can be made to our common verſion, which I have followed, is, that there wants a ל before האדם: but this, although not a common, is however an ellipſis, of which ſeveral examples may be ſeen in Tympius; and particularly in the word אדם. I ſhall quote only Prov. 20. 25. Eccleſ. 12. 13. and Ezek. 12. 10.

Ver. 20. *Until it be ſubdued*—עד רדתה—by Montanus rendered, *donec domineris ei:* and ſo equivalently all the ant. tranſlators, ſave Sep. who conſidered רדת not as the 2d perſon ſing. active; but as the infinitive with the affix ה, and render ἑως αν παραδοθῃ: which, with our laſt tranſlators, I have followed.

* This verſion they borrowed from the Genevans; but, in my opinion, did not improve it. They did well, indeed, to put the words "for the tree of the field is man's life" in a parentheſis: but if they had, with the Genevans, tranſpoſed it to the end of the verſe, the meaning would have been clearer.—Our more antient verſions generally follow the Septuagint.—Purver, after ſcouting the common verſions, gives us his own in theſe words: "So ſhalt not cut them down "(becauſe the trees of the field are *for* man) to go from before thee into the ſiege."—Similar is Bate's tranſlation.

† *Neque enim eſt homo arbor agri, ut hæc ſe contra te vallo muniat:* followed by Michaëlis.

§ "*Sunt enim, O homo!* "*arbores agreſtes, quibus ad obſidionem uti potes.* Hæc hujus commatis interpretatio mihi videtur facillima, et totius orationis "nexui aptiſſima."

CHAP.

CHAP. XXI.

Ver. 4. *SOME ever-flowing torrent*—נחל איתן—Sep. *φαραγγα τραχειαν*—Vulg. *vallem aſperam atque ſaxoſam*—Onk. נחל בור—and ſo equivalently Tharg. and Arab. Erp.—Saadias has a word equivalent to that of Sep. צעב—but Perſ. and Gr. Ven. ſtick more cloſely to the radical meaning of the Heb. the former having רודי קוי, *a ſtrong ſtream*; the latter, *χειμαρρουν κραταιον*. Both theſe terms are certainly more expreſſive of the meaning, than either *a rough* or *rugged valley**. I have no doubt of נחל איתן being here *a brook that never dries, torrens perennis*, and conſequently cannot be laboured. See the Arab. ותן, and its derivatives: or Michaëlis's *Suppl. ad Lex. Heb.* p. 1189.

Ver. 7. *Our hands have not ſhed.* The preſent text has שפכה: a real ſoleciſm, which the *Keri* bids us remove, and read שפכו. But Schultens, Glaſſius, and even Roſenmüller, defend the preſent reading, and bring doubtful examples to ſupport it. But why have recourſe to ſuch ſubterfuges, when not only the Keri, but all the Sam. copies and 6 or 7 Heb. MSS. have the regular and proper word, שפכו?

Ver. 12. *Pare her nails*—עשתה את צפרניה—lit. *faciet ungues ſuos*; in the ſame ſenſe, I preſume, as the French ſay *faire la barbe* for *to ſhave the beard.* In this ſenſe the Heb. word was underſtood by Sep. Vulg. Syr. Tharg.—But Onk. both Arabs, and Perſ. have words that denote quite the contrary, namely, *to nouriſh the nails*, and *let them grow*, inſtead of paring them †. And this meaning is preferred by Dathe and Roſenmüller ‡: becauſe the woman was to give ſigns of mourning: "quoniam mulier ſigna luctus edere debebat."—But if *ſhaving the head* was a ſign of mourning, why might not *paring the nails?* Or, *vice verſa*, if *nouriſhing the nails* were a ſign of mourning, one would think that *nouriſhing the hair* ſhould be equally ſo.—Delgado's obſervation on this paſſage is to me not very intelligible: "Theſe "injunctions (ſays he) laid on a heathen woman taken captive, before ſhe be taken to wife, "are certainly meant *to render her diſagreeable to him:* therefore I ſhould think *Let her nails* "*grow* is much properer than to pare them: beſides, ſhe would pare them without any injunc- "tion, and the Hebrew may bear one ſenſe as well as the other."—Here is a poſtulate, which cannot eaſily be granted; and an inference, which ſeems badly drawn. Why ſhould the injunction be made, to render the woman diſagreeable? or, how would paring the nails have that effect?—For the reſt, I doubt very much, if the Heb. will bear *one ſenſe as well as the other.*

Ver. 14. *Nor make a ſlave of her.* The Heb. word תתעמר, which occurs only here and again in chap. 24. 7. has been variouſly rendered—By Sep. *αθετησεις*—Vulg. *opprimere per potentiam*—and ſo equivalently Onkelos.—But the other ant. interpreters ſeem to have conſidered it as almoſt ſynonymous to the preceding תמכר—and ſo our common verſion, "thou ſhalt not make

* The former is our common verſion, followed by Bate; the latter that of Purver. Delgado corrects our common verſion thus—*unto a rough ſtream*; which correſponds with Perſ. and Gr. Ven. He juſtly obſerves, that as the ceremony was to be "performed over a place that had never been tilled or ſown, a river that hath a ſtrong ſtream is choſen: for "there we are certain that it could never have been manured; which cannot be aſcertained of a rough valley."—What he adds, namely, that נחל never ſignifies any thing elſe than *a river* or *brook*, is not ſo well. † Gr. Ven. moſt literally: *ποιησει τε τους ονυχας εαυτης—ſhe ſhall do her nails:* and, I think, we ſometimes uſe a ſimilar mode of phraſing. ‡ But Michaëlis follows Sep. Vulg. &c. "ihre nägel abſchneiden."

"merchandiſe

"merchandiſe of her;" followed by Purver—Bate: "thou ſhalt not make any advantage of "her."—Delgado imagines that the meaning may be formed from בין העמרים in Ruth 2. 15. and would render: "thou ſhalt not make a parcel of her for ſale."—But as this makes a ſort of tautology with the foregoing comma, I think we muſt ſeek ſome other meaning in the kindred dialects. Now not only in Chald. and Arab. עמר has the meaning of *ſervio, miniſtro*, &c. but in the Sam. dialect it denotes *ſubjicio, in ſervitutem redigo, dominari:* ſo that Jerom has not badly paraphraſed the whole colon: *nec vendere poteris pecuniâ, nec opprimere per potentiam:* but the Greek of Venice is here peculiarly happy, ουχ υπηρετηθησῃ εν αυτῃ. I have no doubt of this being the real meaning.

Ver. 15. This and the two following verſes contain the only Moſaical law reſpecting polygamy; which, at firſt ſight, might ſeem to ſtint the huſband to *two* wives: but there is here no formal limitation, and the Hebrew nation never underſtood that there was a prohibition to marry more than two. With reſpect to the natural lawfulneſs of polygamy, about which ſo much has of late been written, it principally depends on the queſtion whether, in general, more females are born than males; and whether, in ſome climates and countries, more females are born than in other climes and countries. If we can truſt Bruce (vol. i. p. 284), in Meſopotamia, Armenia, Syria, from Mouſul to Aleppo and Antioch, the proportion is fully *two* women to *one* man. In his progreſs ſouthward, he found the proportion of females increaſe; and from Suez to the ſtraits of Babelmandel, which contains the three Arabias, the proportion was fully *four* women to *one* man*: "which proportion (adds he) I have reaſon to believe, holds as far as "the line and 30 degrees beyond it."—But according to the report of a Maronite prieſt, employed to number thoſe of his nation at Aleppo in 1740, their number was found to be 3033; of whom 1500 were males, and 1553 females. Although Dr. Ruſſel did not entirely rely on the accuracy of this report, he is inclined to think, that the diſproportion of males to females, at Aleppo, is not ſo conſiderable as it appeared to Bruce. See note 79 to vol. i. of Aleppo, p. 440.

Ver. 20. *A profligate*—וולל—Sep. συμβολοκοπων—Vulg. *qui commeſſationibus vacat*—Onk. and Gr. Ven. make him *a fleſh-devourer*, κρεωβορος—and our Engliſh tranſlators, *a glutton.*—The word has a more indefinite meaning, and denotes a baſe, vile, abandoned *profligate*; vulgarly *a blackguard.*

Ver. 23. *A hanging* corſe. There is in the Heb. only תלוי; or, as Sam. תלא; or, as 4 Sam. MSS. תלואי, *ſuſpenſus.* But Sep. has πας κρεμαμενος επι ξυλου—Vulg. *qui pendet in ligno:* and ſo the comma is quoted by Paul, Galat. 3. 13. But there is no veſtige of επι ξυλου in any other verſion, not even the Syriac: and this is an inſtance, againſt Dr. Kennicott, of the inſufficiency of a New-Teſtament quotation, to be alone a ſecure authority for correcting the text of the Old Teſtament. Paul quoted the Septuagint as he found it in the Helleniſtic ſynagogues, without giving himſelf any trouble to compare it with the original; with which, perhaps, he was little acquainted; for we know that a Jew of that day might be a learned, a very learned man, and yet but ſlightly acquainted with the Hebrew language: witneſs Philo.—For the reſt, the *curſe* here mentioned falls, not on the perſon for merely *hanging* on the wood; but for having merited that death: as was very properly underſtood by Onk. Syr. Saadias.

* It was this, perhaps, that induced the Arabic Prophet to limit polygamy to *four* wives.

CHAP. XXII.

Ver. 9. *YOUR vineyards*—כרמך—Sep. *τον αμπελωνα*—Vulg. *vineam*—and equivalently all the other verſions, except Syr. which has כרבך, *thy tilled field*. Did the tranſlator read here, as in Levit. 19. 19. שדך? or gave he to כרם a different meaning? One is apt to think that שד, and not כרם, was in both places the original reading: for we *ſow* a field, but *plant* a vineyard. Nor is the verb זרע, *to ſow*, any where elſe, I think, applied to a vineyard; but always the verb נטע, *to plant*. The beſt mode of reconciling all is to ſay, either that כרם is here, as well as in ſome other places, to be taken in a general meaning, and denotes any *fertile tilled field*; and is equivalent to שדה; (ſee Rem. on Levit. 2. 14.) or that the precept goes to forbid the ſowing of ſeeds of any kind in a vineyard, amongſt the vines; and this, indeed, ſeems inferable from what follows: "leſt ye profane the whole crop," &c. Where note, that the word rendered *profane* is קדש, which has a double meaning, *to ſanctify*, and *to profane*; as ברך, *to bleſs*, and *to curſe*: although, properly ſpeaking, the radical meaning is neither the one nor the other.—See Rem. on Pſ. 16. 3. and Job 1. 5.

Ver. 12. *Tie-ſtrings*—גדלים, or rather גדילים, as it is in 15 MSS.—by Sep. very properly rendered *στρεπτα*, and by Vulg. *funiculos*. Theſe *ſtrings* or *ribbons* were, I conceive, to tie the coverlet to the bed-poſts: which might be deemed the more neceſſary, as a whole family often ſlept in one chamber, on different beds; and theſe only covered with a ſingle rug. See Harmer's *Obſervations*, vol. i. p. 165.

Ver. 13. "This law (ſays Delgado) ſeems, at firſt ſight, to be contradictory to that in Exodus, chap. xxii. ver. 15. [16.] where it appears to be no crime for a ſingle woman to lie "with a man; the man only is puniſhed by a pecuniary fine: and as for the deceit, that never "could be puniſhed with death: ſo that this muſt mean, that her huſband proves that ſhe loſt "her virginity after ſhe had been betrothed to him; which is a capital offence, as appears by "ver. 23."—This is an odd way of reaſoning. How was the huſband to prove that his wife had loſt her virginity after being betrothed to him, unleſs he knew her to be a virgin before that period? The crime is evidently to be placed to the deceit practiſed upon the huſband.——To what I have ſaid on this law, in my Explanatory Note, I have only to add, that they who wiſh to ſee the matter phyſically and theologically diſcuſſed, may conſult Buffon, and more eſpecially Michaëlis's *Moſaical Juriſprudence*, vol. ii. ſect. 92. See alſo Arvieux *Des Mœurs des Arabes*, and Niebuhr *Deſcription de l'Arabie*.

Ver. 15. Among the Mohammedans, the tokens of virginity are ſhown by the bride's mother, to any of the females who chooſe to ſee them, but to none of the men, ſave the bridegroom. See Notes and Illuſtrations to Ruſſel's *Aleppo*, vol. i. p. 433.

Ver. 18. *And chaſtiſe him*—ויסרו אתו—Sep. *παιδευσουσιν αυτον*—and ſo Gr. Ven.—but Vulg. *verberabunt illum*: in which ſenſe it was underſtood by Onk. Tharg. and Joſephus; who ſays that the puniſhment was 39 ſtripes—*πληγας τεσσαρακοντα, μιας λειπουσης*. Ant. lib. iv. c. 8. No. 23. p. 241. This is the common opinion of the Jewiſh commentators. But it ſeems more probable, that the chaſtiſement was an arbitrary one, not exceeding, however, the number of 40 ſtripes, according to the law ch. 25. 3.—Some think that the Hebrew word means, here, only

only *to rebuke, reprimand*.—For the reſt, the Samaritan text has הדוא after האיש, which is more expreſs and emphatical; and is the reading of one of Kennicott's MSS.

Ver. 21. A conſiderable number of Heb. and Chald. MSS. have ALL *the men of her own city* —כל אנשי.

Ib. *By playing the harlot in her father's houſe*—לזנות בית אביה. But the Sam. reading is להזנות את בית אביה—and Sep. εκπορνευσαι τον οικον του πατρος αυτης—Vulg. *ut fornicaretur in domo patris ſui*—Gr. Ven. τω πορνευειν οικοι του πατρος αυτης—and ſo equivalently the other verſions.

CHAP. XXIII.

Ver. 1. al. 2. *NO man deprived*, &c. The Heb. is פצוע דכא וכרות שפכה—by Montanus rendered, *læſus attritione, et abſciſſione veretri*—and by our Engliſh tranſlators, "He that is wounded "in the ſtones, or hath his privy member cut off."—So, but more paraphraſtically, Vulg. *eunuchus attritis vel amputatis teſticulis, et* [vel] *abſciſſo veretro*—Sep. more conciſely, θλαδιας ουδε αποκεκομμενος—Gr. Ven. τομιας θλαδιας, και τετμημενος την ουρηθραν.—All the other verſions are nearly conſimilar; except Syr. which for the four Heb. words has only גירא, *an adulterer!*

Ib. *Into the ſociety of the Lord*—בקהל יהוה—Sep. εις εκκλησιαν Κυριου—Vulg. *in eccleſiam Domini*.—The meaning of which, in this and the following verſes, according to Biſhop Law and ſome other commentators, is, "that ſuch perſons are not to be admitted to officiate or be "in the magiſtracy."—I am more inclined to believe, with Tharg. that matrimonial connections are forbidden. The obſervation of Delgado appears to be juſt: "*Not to enter into the congrega-* "*tion of the Lord*, muſt mean not to marry an Hebrew woman: for it would be uncharitable "to debar any body from becoming a member of the congregation, if he be perſuaded that "theirs is the true religion: and that this phraſe ſignifies an intermarriage, may be learned "from Geneſis, ch. 34. 16. *Then we will give our daughters unto you, and we will take your* "*daughters unto us, and we will become one people*—which ſhows that intermarrying conſolidates "an alien with the nation."

Ver. 2. *A mamzer*—ממזר. Variouſly underſtood and rendered. Sep. εκ πορνης—Vulg. *de ſcorto natus*—and ſo literally Tharg. רמתיליר מן זנו—Onk. retains the Heb. word—Syr. בר גורא —Saad. אלזנים—Erp. פרג אלזנא, *a whore's bird*.—Perſ. retains the Heb. word—Gr. Ven. νοθος.— All agree in this, that ממזר is *a ſpurious child, born of a proſtitute*. Michaëlis was not pleaſed with this meaning, and ſought another in זר מום, *macula peregrini*: i. e. *peregrinus infamis*, as Dathe, who adopts Michaëlis's conjecture, renders. One of Kennicott's MSS. appeared to them to favour this meaning; as that MS. has מומזר. But this ſeems to me a feeble aid: and I ſee no reaſon to depart from the antients. Delgado, however, who moſt probably never read Michaëlis, makes a ſimilar conjecture. He thinks that ממזר, from זר* *an alien*, ſignifies *one of a ſtrange nation*, but adds: "I give this as a conjecture of my own, though the traditional expla- "nation of the Rabbins contradicts it; for they ſay that ממזר means *a natural ſon begotten*

* It may be queſtioned whether ממזר is to be derived from זר. Wepler (in his Philoſophical and Critical Fragments) compares it with the Arabic מדר, *corrumpere*; of which he takes it to be the participle of *Hiphil*. In this ſuppoſition מזר will be the Heb. root. But, ſuppoſing it to be a derivative from זר, ſtill it may denote *a ſpurious brood*; one ſprung from *a ſtrange unknown father*: and this I am ſtrongly inclined to think is the real meaning of ממזר.

" *by inceſt*; ſuch as by a ſiſter, a daughter, or a married woman: and though the law muſt be " determined according to their deciſion, by which we muſt abide, nevertheleſs we have the " liberty of underſtanding Scripture as our judgment may direct us, provided we act according " to their deciſion." This is genuine orthodoxy.

Ver. 4. *From Phethor*—מפתור—or, as Sam.* מפתרה; for which there is nothing in Sep. and Vulg. But all the other ant. interpreters have it, and read as the preſent Heb. It is probably the ſame with *Balis*, a ſmall town on the weſt ſide of the Euphrates. See Buſching, tom. xiii. p. 304. of the 2d German edition.

Ver. 13. It is ſtrange how the Roman editors of the Vulgate could divide and point this verſe and the following as they have done, making *Quo relevatus es* a part of ver. 14.; whereas in all the prior editions, that I have ſeen, the 14th verſe begins with *Dominus*.

Ver. 17. What I have rendered " a catamite," קדש, I now ſuſpect to be ſome ſuch perſon as the *bherooàh* among the Hindoos; that is, a ſort of pimp, or attendant muſician upon proſtitutes. See the Hindoo Code, p. 171.

Ver. 18. *The price of a dog*—מחיר כלב—Sep. αλλαγμα κυνος—Vulg. *pretium canis*—and ſo equivalently all the verſions down to Gr. Ven. which has, not improperly, τιμημα κυνος. The queſtion among commentators is, whether the word *dog* is here to be taken in a literal or in a figurative ſenſe. Le Clerc maintains the latter, againſt Bochart and Spencer: but their opinion has been defended by Ikenius, and appears to be juſt. Legiſlators are not wont to uſe metaphoric expreſſions in the wording of their precepts. The claſſing of the hire of a proſtitute, and the price or hire of a dog, together, was natural enough: and the hire or price of either muſt be ſuppoſed an odious offering at the altar of God. Roſenmüller, however, defends Le Clerc's explanation: " Sed priorem illam interpretationem, quidquid etiam viri iſti doctiſ- " ſimi dicant, poſtulat orationis filum: nec intelligo quomodo cuipiam in mentem venire poſſit, " pretium ex cane vendito templo conſecrare. *Pretium canis* eſt pretium ex *cynedo* ſolutum. " Canis autem vocatur talis homo impurus, quod canes in via coeuntes imitatur: unde et " κυναιδος apud Græcos. Conſtat autem, Phœnices mercedem uſuræ corporis ſui Deo voviſſe." Houbigant had before defended the ſame opinion. Michaëlis and Hezel think that כלב here means a Sodomite†: but Dathe, *pretium ex vendito cane*. I have retained the word *dog* in my verſion: but the reader may underſtand it of a four-legged dog, or of a two-legged dog, as he deems the moſt probable‡.

CHAP. XXIV.

Ver. 1. *ON account of ſome defect which he finds in her*. The Hebrew words which I render " ſome defect," ערות דבר, are by Montanus rendered *nuditatem verbi*—by our Engliſh tranſlators, *ſomething unclean*—Sep. ασχημον πραγμα §—Vulg. *aliquam fœditatem*—and ſo equivalently Onk. Syr. and both Arabs. But Tharg. || עבירת פתגם, *ſome tranſgreſſion*: and this *tranſ-*

* The printed Sam. wants the prefix: but one MS. has, I think, preſerved the true reading. † The former renders מחיר כלב " lohn für knabenſchande"—the latter, " geld für knabenſchande." Luther had rendered " hundegeld." ‡ On the laws reſpecting *uſury* in this chapter, ſee Michaëlis's *Moſaical Juriſprudence*, ſo often already referred to, part iii. ſect. 152. § Very ſimilarly Gr. Ven. ασχημοσυνην πραγματος. || Miſprinted מתנן in Pol.

greſſion,

greſſion, by Rabbi Sammai and his followers, is ſuppoſed to be *adultery*. But R. Hillel and his party extend the ערות דבר to whatever may diſpleaſe the huſband. The opinion of the Sammaites is untenable; for adultery was puniſhed with death: but the opinion of the Hillelites appears to be too lax. It is probable that either ſome very great bodily blemiſh, or ſome baſe immoral habit, was meant by the legiſlator. Delgado has well remarked, that "the firſt three "verſes in this chapter contain a chain of ſucceſſive events, finiſhing with the caſe in ver. 3.; "and ver. 4. expreſſes what will be the law in ſuch a caſe." Our critics would ſay, that the firſt three verſes are a *protaſis*, the fourth an *apodoſis*.

Ver. 3. *A bill of divorce*—ספר כריתת—Sep. *βιβλιον αποστασιου*—Vulg. *libellum repudii*—more literally Gr. Ven. *βιβλιον τομης*, for ſuch is the import of the Heb. word כריתת—*libellum abſciſſionis*; not *excidii*, as Montanus renders it. At Aleppo (ſays Dr. Ruſſel) a man may on very ſlight pretences get rid of his wife by law: but when a woman is thus divorced, ſhe reclaims her dowery, except in ſome particular caſes. If the man ſhould repent of what he has done before the expiration of three months, the power of aſking the woman back reſts with him: but if he permit that time to elapſe without declaring his intention, the woman may then refuſe her conſent, and is free to marry whom ſhe pleaſes. The power of the man, however, is limited to *two* divorces; for, if he divorce her a third time, he cannot take her back until ſhe have conſummated a marriage with ſome other man; by whom, after the term preſcribed by the Koran, ſhe may legally be divorced. *Aleppo*, vol. i. p. 278.

Ver. 15. *Day by day*—Heb. ביומו—*in die ejus*—or, as Gr. Ven. *εν τη ημερα αυτου*—Sep. *αυθημερον*—Vulg. *eodem die*. It evidently means, that the hire is to be paid every day, as long as the ſervice continues.

Ver. 17. *And to the orphan.* The preſent Heb. has no copulative before *orphan*, but reads thus: לא תטה משפט גר יתום: "Thou ſhalt not decline doing juſtice to the ſtranger orphan:" and what is more ſingular, this is alſo the reading of Sam.—But moſt* of the ant. interpreters muſt have read ויתום; and this is ſtill the reading of 12 of Kennicott's MSS. De Roſſi found this ſame reading in 7 MSS. of Onkelos, and in the printed edition of Sora 1490.—The other addition in this verſe, "and to the widow," I have inſerted, in my verſion, on the authority of Sep. and 2 Heb. MSS. This was, at firſt, the reading of one of De Roſſi's copies of Onkelos: and by comparing the precept with Exod. 22. 21. Jerem. 22. 3.† and Zach. 7. 10. one muſt be convinced, I think, that this is no interpolation.

CHAP. XXV.

Ver. 2. *SHALL cauſe him to be laid down*—הפילו, from נפל. The Septuagint took it here to be in the imperative mood, as it is in Joſh. 13. 16. and render *καθιεις αυτον εναντι των κριτων*. But this rendering is incompatible with the preſent Heb. text; (which agrees with Sam.) in which

* It is a miſtake in Houbigant to ſay, that all the verſions in the Polyglott have the copulative, ſave Onkelos. It is wanting in Perſ. It was alſo wanting in the copies of Arab. Erp. and Gr. Ven. which latter has, very literally, *Ου κλινεις κρισιν παροικου ορφανου*. But that the other reading is the genuine one, is clear: and our tranſlators had no reaſon to put *nor* in Italics. † Miſprinted, in my Explanatory Note, 23.

the

the word השופט is evidently the nominative to הפיל: and ſo it was underſtood by all the other antient interpreters. The Rabbins tell us that the ſcourge uſed had three cords, ſo that every ſtroke was counted three ſtripes: by which means they could not give more than 39 without paſſing the number of 40. Jarhi ſays that a part of thoſe ſtripes were given on the back, and a part on the breaſt and belly: but this is not very credible.

Ver. 3. *Should faint before your eyes*—נקלה לעיניך—Sep. ασχημονησει ενωπιον σου—Vulg. paraphraſes the whole comma thus: *ne fœdè laceratus ante oculos tuos abeat frater tuus*—Onk. and Syr. retain the Heb. word—Tharg. יתבזי, *be contemptible*—and ſo equivalently both Arabs, Perſ. and Gr. Ven. which laſt has ατιμασθη.—Michaelis rejects all theſe interpretations, and takes קלה in its common ſignification of *urere*, correſponding with the Latin metaphor *urere loris*: and Dathe thinks this a very ingenious and probable explanation. Ingenious it certainly is: but I cannot think it ſo probable. I ſee no reaſon to depart from the common derivation, although I think that the antients have much miſtaken the meaning of נקלה. It can hardly mean here, to be diſhonoured, or made contemptible: for, as Michaëlis moſt juſtly obſerves, how could more than forty laſhes make a criminal more contemptible than forty? The end of the precept is evidently to prevent an exceſſive puniſhment, which might prove fatal to the life of the perſon. Without having recourſe, then, to Michaëlis's metaphor, I find in קלל the true meaning of נקלה, which is here not *to be vilified*, or *ſeem vile*; but *to be faint, languid, exhauſted*. Compare the Chaldee קלקל, and the Syr. and Arab. קל, and you will have little doubt, I think, that this is the true meaning of נקלה in this paſſage.

Ver. 4. *Ye ſhall not muzzle an ox when he is treading out the grain.* This was to oppoſe the uſage of Egypt, where the ox was muzzled during his labour in the treading floor. But the Mohammedans of Aleppo, and the Moors of Africa, obſerve the Moſaical "cuſtom of allowing "the oxen who ſeparate the corn from the ſtraw to eat what they pleaſe." See Ruſſel's *Aleppo*, vol. i. p. 50; Hoeſt's *Nacrichten von Fex und Morocco*, p. 129; and Michaëlis's *Moſaical Juriſprudence*, tom. iii. ſect. 130—as on the law contained in ver. 6—10. the reader will do well to conſult the ſame work, tom. ii. ſect. 98.

Ver. 9. *Spit before him*—יקרה בפניו—by our tranſlators rendered, *ſpit in his face*; on which Delgado: "I think the Engliſh tranſlator wrong, in rendering this paſſage ridiculous, by tranſ-"lating it, without any need, that *ſhe ſhould ſpit in his face.*" Yet in this meaning the phraſe ſeems to have been underſtood by moſt of the antient interpreters. The verſion of Sep. is indeed ambiguous; or, rather, their true reading is uncertain. The Roman ed. and Canonici's MS. have εμπτυσεται* κατα προσωπον αυτου: which may ſignify *before his face:* but all the other editions, with Glaſg. have εις το προσωπον: and ſo ſeems to have read the Copt. tranſlator. The old Ital. is loſt. Here, again, we eagerly wait for Holmes's collation. Vulg. is clear, *ſpuetque in faciem illius*—and ſo equivalently Onk. Syr. Perſ. and Gr. Ven.†: but both Arabs have more properly בחצרתה, *in his preſence:* and the Thargum ſays, ſhe was *to ſpit a good deal before him*, קדמוי, that ſhe might be ſeen by the elders. That this is the true meaning, I have no doubt.

* Oxon. and Canon. have εμπτυσει. † πτυσει τ'εις το προσωπον αυτου.

CHAP.

CHAP. XXVI.

Ver. 3. *THY God*—אלהיך—and ſo all the verſions ſave Sep. which in the Rom. ed. and in Alex.* and Glaſg. has τῳ Θεῳ μου: and this reading is defended by Houbigant in the following manner: "Mendum אלהיך non geſtabant in ſuis codicibus Græci interpretes, utpote "qui vertunt τῳ Θεῳ μου, legantque אלהי, quod omnino eſt legendum. Id mendum vetus eſſe "liquet ex verſionibus Chald. et Syr. Sed ipsâ ex vetuſtate mendi fons aperitur. Nam cum "olim non eſſent litteræ finales, facillimum fuit, ut pro אלהי כי, quod ſcriptum legeretur, "iteraretur per imprudentiam littera כ hoc modo אלהיכ כי; cum præſertim his in verſibus ſæpe "recurreret verbum אלהיך, Moſe populum alloquente. Ob eam vero ipſam cauſam quod Moſes, "ad populum ſermonem habens, dicat אלהיך, *Deus tuus*, convenit ut populus dicat אלהי, *Deo* "*meo*; minimè verò ut idem populus ſacerdoti dicat *Deo tuo*, eo præſertim loco, ubi agitur non "ſacerdos, ſed ipſe populus *Deo ſuo* gratias ob fruges, eo providente, natas et adultas, ex "quibus primitias offerre poſſit." There are, I doubt not, who will be of Houbigant's opinion: but his rule of *congruency* is a precarious criterion; and as all the copies of both texts, and all the other ant. verſions down to Gr. Ven. incluſively, have the other reading, I have adopted it in my tranſlation.

Ver. 5. *My forefather was a wandering Aramite*—ארמי אבד אבי—by our tranſlators rendered, "A Syrian ready to periſh *was* my father." It is a difficult paſſage, which was differently underſtood by the antient interpreters; who ſeem to have gueſſed the beſt they could at ſomething like a conſiſtent meaning. Sep. Συριαν απεβαλεν† ὁ πατηρ μου. If this be the true Septuagint lection, it is plain they combined the Hebrew letters in a different manner; that is, they conſidered אבי as a nominative governing the verb, not in concordance with it, and muſt have either not read the י at all, or disjoined it from ארם, and added it to אבד. It was this, perhaps, that led Houbigant to his conjectural emendation of the text, and his novel explanation of it. He writes the words thus: ארם יאבד אבי, and renders *fames urgebat patrem meum*: "ex poteſtate ea cujus ſuperſunt Arabica in lingua non una veſtigia. Nam ארם Ara-"bicè habet *abſumere*. Item ארמא, *terra deſolata*." Few critics, I believe, will accede to this explanation.—Let us return to the antients. Vulg. *Syrus perſequebatur patrem meum*—and ſo equivalently Onk. Tharg. Saad. Perſ. All theſe‡ make ארמי the nominative, and אבי the objective, and אבד the third perſon præt. of the active voice, called *pihel*. But the Maſorites have pointed the word as a participle, and, I think, juſtly. Three of Kennicott's MSS. have אובד; which I take to be the genuine reading, and was rather aſtoniſhed not to find in the Sam. copies. But if אובד or אבֵד be the true reading, what is its true meaning? I think its true

* It was wrong in Grabe to thruſt μου into the margin, and place σου in his text; as the other is a very probable reading, and was followed by the Coptic tranſlator. † So Ald. Rom. and ſo read the Copt. tranſlator: but the reading of Comp. is απελιπεν, and that of Alex. απελαβεν. Perhaps none of the three readings is the original one: at leaſt, if they read in their Heb. copy the words we now read. At any rate, their verſion, as it ſtands at preſent, is unintelligible. ‡ Not ſo Gr. Ven. which has Αραμιος απωλλυτο ὁ πατηρ μου. Singular is the reading of Syr. לארם אתדבר אבי, *ad Aram deductus eſt pater me*, as it is rendered in Pol. but which, perhaps, would be better rendered *converſatus eſt apud Aramum*, i. e. *Labanum*: if indeed the copies be not corrupted, as I greatly ſuſpect. Yet I find no variation among Thorndike's MS. readings.

meaning

meaning is what I have given in my verſion; *wandering*, like a pilgrim, from place to place; according to his own account of himſelf to Pharaoh: "The days of the years of my ſojourn-"ment (or peregrination) are an hundred and thirty years." See the note on that place.—Michaëlis's verſion adopted by Hezel is: "Mein vater war ein herumirrender Meſopotamier"—that of Dathe: *Pater meus fuit Syrus oberrans.* I add Roſenmüller's ſcholium: "*Aramæus* "*vagus* (cum gregibus deſerta pererrans, Nomas.) *erat pater meus.* Syrus gente, patria extor-"ris, inter Chanaanitas paſcuas, nullis certis ſedibus, pererrans: אבד non eſt vertendum *perditus* "vel *periturus*; nam Abrahamus, Iſaacus et Jacobus divites erant ac potentes: ſed *errans* ut "Pſ. 119. 176."

Ver. 17, 18. There is a term which occurs in each of theſe verſes, that has been variouſly rendered: האמרת in ver. 17. and האמיר in ver. 18. It is agreed that they are both in the coactive voice of אמר; but their preciſe meaning is diſputed. In both places Sep. has the ſame verb, ειλου and ειλατο—and Vulg. *elegiſti* and *elegit*—Onk. חטבת and חטב, in Pol. rendered *elegiſti* and *elegit*; but, perhaps, better *exaltaſti* and *exaltavit:* which ſeems to be the meaning in which the words were underſtood by Saad. and Perſ. certainly by Arab. Erp. and Gr. Ven. the former of which has שרפת and שרף; the latter, επηραας and επηρε. This comes nearly to the interpretation of ſome modern critics; who, finding in the Arabic a ſignification of אמר that indicates *empire, domination*, &c. imagine that האמיר may here be rendered *principatum* concedere. So Dathe: *Vos quidem Jovæ hodie principatum concediſtis*—"Quæ inter-"pretatio (ſays Roſenmüller) ſane ſenſum aptiſſimum efficere videtur." Not to me, I confeſs; who am inclined to think, with Houbigant, that the mood *hiphil*, or coactive voice, here only ſtrengthens the ſignification of the active voice *kal:* and, conſequently, that האמיר ſignifies *to declare ſolemnly*; or, as our common verſion has it, *to avouch*. Michaëlis and Hezel think it means *to make an agreement*; from the Arab. ſignification of אמר, *conſentire, mutuo promittere:* and this comes nearly to the ſame purpoſe as mutually *to declare*; which laſt word I have preferred in my verſion. For the reſt, the words "and his decrees," ומשפטיו, are wanting in all the Sam. copies, and in one of Kennicott's Heb. MSS.*

CHAP. XXVII.

Ver. 2. *AND join them with lime*—ושדת אתם בשיד—Sep. κονιασεις αυτους κονιᾳ—Vulg. *calce lævigabis eos*—and ſo nearly equivalently the other verſions. But the Greek of Venice has a word which, perhaps, the beſt of all expreſſes the meaning of the original, τιτανωσεις τ'αυτους εν τιτανῳ: by which, I conceive, is not meant that the ſtones were to be plaſtered over with plaſter, as our public tranſlation has it; but that they were to be cemented together with mortar. The idea of ſome modern interpreters, that the ſtones were firſt to be inſcribed on, and then to be coated over with plaſter, the better to preſerve the inſcription, appears to me to be a mere fancy. The end of the inſcription was undoubtedly, that it might be at all times

* The copies of Sep. vary. Rom. Ambroſ. Canon. have only τα δικαιωματα και τα κριματα—Alex. and Glaſg. add αυτου after κριματα, but want και τας εντολας αυτου, with Rom. and 1 Heb. MS.—Ald. and Comp. have και τας εντολας, without αυτου either after εντολας or after the preceding δικαιωματα—But the Oxford MS. is as full as the preſent Heb. τα δικαιωματα αυτου, και τας εντολας αυτου, και τα κριματα αυτου.

legible

legible to every Iſraelite. To cover it over with plaſter would be to lock it from the ſight of the people, and to render it an uſeleſs dumb monitor. Others ſuppoſe that the writing was upon the plaſter itſelf; and this I ſhould deem more probable, if a writing of that kind were durable, when expoſed to the winds and weather; which, when done in *freſco*, I am told it is. But it is a queſtion, if the Iſraelites underſtood painting in freſco: and ſtones would naturally occur to their legiſlator, as the moſt proper material for preſerving his injunctions. Whether thoſe, here mentioned, comprehended the whole law or Deuteronomy, or only the ten commandments, or the bleſſings and curſes recorded in this chapter, is a ſubject of controverſy among our commentators, which I ſhall not enter into. My own opinion I have given in my Explanatory Note. The objection, that the Deuteronomy would have taken ſuch a number of ſtone tables, as could hardly be erected in one place, is in my apprehenſion a weak one. The ſtones are ſaid to be "large ſtones," each of which might contain a whole chapter, for aught we know. Now, four-and-thirty ſuch ſtones would not make a very long wall, were each of them ſuppoſed to be three feet wide: but if they were arranged in a ſolid ſquare, they would preſent a face of leſs than thirty feet; and ſurely on four ſuch faces the whole Deuteronomy might be inſcribed in capitals, large enough to be read at a conſiderable diſtance; eſpecially if they were deep cut in the ſtone.

Ver. 4. There is in this verſe a various or rather a contradictory reading in Sam. text and verſion, *Garizim* inſtead of *Ebal:* and this, in our days, has given riſe to a vehement controverſy. Dr. Kennicott has laboured to prove that the Samaritan lection is genuine, and that the Jews have corrupted their copies out of odium to that nation, and to their temple which was conſtructed on mount *Garizim*. Several anſwers have been made to his arguments, which in my opinion are more ſpecious than ſolid; not excepted even thoſe of Verſchuir, although his countrymen deem them proofs. The controverſy between the Jews and Samaritans, about their reſpective temples, is nothing to the purpoſe. The queſtion then was not, whether *Garizim* or *Ebal* was the place *of bleſſing*; but whether the temple at Jeruſalem or the temple at Samaria was the moſt holy place. If the Jewiſh temple had been built on mount *Ebal*, the Samaritans might have had ſome temptation to alter their copies: but as both mountains were unoccupied when they reared their temple, they had the choice of erecting it on either of the mountains: and is it in the ſmalleſt degree probable, that, if they had found in their copy of the Deuteronomy the bleſſings addreſſed to mount Ebal, they would not have choſen that mountain for the ſite of their temple?—Whereas, when their temple had been built on mount Garizim, becauſe there Moſes had ordered the covenant-ſtones, and an altar to be erected, it was quite natural for their enemies the Jews, in order to diſcredit their temple, to alter the names in the book of Deuteronomy, and for *Garizim* inſert *Ebal*.

Such is the light in which the controverſy appears to me: but as it is of very ſmall importance in itſelf, and to us Chriſtians of none at all, I have left *Ebal* in the text.

Ver. 5. Roſenmüller thinks that the altar, mentioned in this verſe, is the ſame with the ſtones on which the law was to be written: "Non eſt novum hoc mandatum a ſuperiore "diverſum; ſed Moſes docet lapides quos antea dixit ſtatuendos et *tectorio oblinendos*, debere "in formam altaris ſe componi." Quis credat hoc? To command the law to be written on a ſet of rough unhewn ſtones, would be a very uncommon commandment: and as to their being

covered over with plaſter, this is begging the queſtion *. I would rather ſay that ver. 8. is an *apodoſis*, belonging to ver. 4. after which I have placed it in my verſion.

Ver. 16. *Deſpiſeth*—מקלה—Sep. and Gr. Ven. ὁ ατιμαζων—Vulg. *qui non honorat*: i. e. "who diſhonours," according to the Scripture idiom. The Syr. tranſlator has a word that denotes rather *to curſe*. The other verſions either retain the Heb. word, or have terms equivalent. But the meaning of the Heb. word itſelf is diſputed. The antients ſeem to have confounded it with קלל. Dathe ſticks to the primary ſignification of קלה, *urere*; which, metaphorically, he thinks, is *to defame*. Michaëlis has "ſchläget," *ſtriketh*. I have followed the antients.

Ver. 26. *All the precepts of this law.* "The word *all* (ſays Dr. Kennicott), which our "tranſlators have inſerted as wanting before *the words of this law*, was thought by Jerom abſo-"lutely neceſſary to juſtify St. Paul's quotation Galat. 3. 10.; and it is very remarkable that "this important word is now found here, not only in the Sam. text and its verſion, but alſo in "4 Hebrew MSS. The Latin verſion of the Chald. paraphraſe has *omnibus* here, in Walton's "Polyglott; though the word is not in the adjoining column of the Chaldee. And though it "is not in the Syr. Arab. or Vulg. verſions, as there printed, I have no doubt, but it may be "found in ſome very ant. MSS. of theſe verſions. It has been found in 6 Chald. MSS." Remarks, p. 81.—I have ſome obſervations to make on this remark. In the firſt place, I have little doubt of *all*, כל, having ſtood originally in the text: as, beſide the authorities here quoted by Kennicott, the Septuagint have εν πασι τοις λογοις, in all the copies that I have ſeen: and ſo the Coptic verſion, and the ant. Italic. But, 2dly, although I conſider it as the true reading, I do not think it of any importance; nor do I believe with Jerom that the Jews threw it out of their text for the reaſon alleged by him†. I believe it dropped out accidentally from the careleſſneſs of tranſcribers; and that too at a very early period; as it was not read by Aquila, Sym. Theod. nor by Jerom himſelf in the Heb. copies of his day. It is found, indeed, in one or two copies of Onkelos‡; but in none of the other verſions.—For the reſt, there is no abſolute need of it: *The precepts* ſay juſt as much as *all the precepts*. When our Saviour ſays, "If thou wouldſt enter into life, obſerve the commandments;" he means as much as if he had ſaid, "obſerve all the commandments:" for, where none are excepted, all are neceſſarily included.

The word אמן, *amen*, which occurs ſo often in this chapter, is variouſly rendered. Sep. γενοιτο, *be it ſo*—Vulg. and all the other verſions retain the Heb. word; except Gr. Ven. which has ειθε, *I ſo wiſh*.—The word is uſed in moſt Liturgies; and was retained by our tranſlators in their verſion of the Bible; as well as by the greater number of foreign tranſlators§.—I have alſo judged it proper to retain it in my verſion.

* Beſides that, if theſe ſtones had been uſed as an altar, the violence of the fire, and the conſtant friction and other injuries, which muſt have ariſen from the near approach of thoſe who placed wood and victims, and entertained the flame, would ſoon have cracked the plaſter, and even the ſtones themſelves; and in time have effaced or defaced the inſcriptions. † "Fruſtra igitur tulerunt Judæi, ne viderentur ſub maledicto, ſi non poſſent omnia complere, quæ "ſcripta ſunt." This remark is unworthy of Jerom. ‡ Kennicott ſays it has been found in ſix: but I find only two in De Roſſi; and one of theſe has been corrected. § Luther, Caſtalio, Junius, the Tigurines, the Dutch, Diodati, the Spaniſh of Ferrara, and of De Valera, &c. The French tranſlations vary. The firſt Genevan has "ainſi ſoit-il," *ſo be it*; but the New Reviſion has "amen"—So Le Gros—but Le Cene has "nous le ſouhaitons"—Dathe, *ita*—Michaëlis, *amen*.

CHAP.

CHAP. XXVIII.

IT is well remarked by Roſenmüller, that we are not to look for the literal completion of the threats and promiſes contained in this long chapter, in the eventual hiſtory of the Iſraelites. The general purport is, that they ſhall be happy in obeying, unhappy in tranſgreſſing, the precepts and ordinances laid down for them. "*Felicitatem* autem, et *mala* Moſes ex more orien- "tali variis depingit coloribus, et omnem hanc deſcriptionem adornat pulchris et ſublimibus "imaginibus." Indeed, the whole is highly poetical.

Ver. 5. *Your baſkets*—טנאך—Sep. αἱ αποθηκαι—and Vulg. *horrea*. But the other verſions have words that denote *baſkets*; and this is undoubtedly the true meaning. It is well rendered by Gr. Ven. ταλαιρος.

Ib. *Kneading-troughs*—משארת—by our tranſlators wrongly rendered *ſtore*; although they elſewhere render the ſame word *kneading-troughs:* and here their marginal reading is *dough* or *kneading-trough*. Purver has *kneading-veſſel*. Bate follows Sep. and Vulg. τα εγκαταλειμματα σου—*reliquiæ tuæ*—but all the other verſions have words that denote ſome dough-veſſel, or *dough* itſelf—Gr. Ven. ἡ ζυμη σου. See my Explan. Note.

Ver. 8. Our tranſlators here had more reaſon to render אסמים *ſtorehouſes:* and I am not ſure, that it is not a better term than the one I have ſubſtituted, *granaries*; if the word *granary* be limited to a ſtorehouſe for *grain* only.—Sep. ταμειαι—Vulg. *cellaria*—Onk. Tharg. and Syr. אוצרין, *treaſuries*—But both Arabs and Gr. Ven. have words that denote *barns*, or *granaries*.

Ver. 15. *And to practiſe all*—ולעשות את כל—for ſo I read (with the copulative) with 5 MSS. and the primitive reading of three more; and with moſt of the antient verſions. The comma, indeed, is wanting in Sam. and I have ſaid in Var. Read. that it was probably not read by Sep. It is indeed in all the printed editions, ſave Rom. but it was not read by the Coptic tranſlator: although it appears to have been in the old Italic verſion. See Sabatier.—For the reſt, thoſe who prefer the preſent reading לעשות, without the copulative, give to the preceding שמר the meaning of זכר. So Roſenmüller, *ut memineris facere:* and ſo equivalently Gr. Ven. φυλαττειν ὡςε ποιειν—and our common verſion, *to obſerve to do:* but the parallel place ver. 13. ſeems to juſtify the other reading.

Ver. 20. *Until ye be deſtroyed and periſh*—עד השמדך ועד אבדך. So the preſent text. But the Sam. copy has עד השמידך ועד האבידך, followed by almoſt all the ant. tranſlators; as is remarked in Var. Read.—It is of little importance, as the meaning is all the ſame.

Ver. 22. *Conſumptions and fevers.* See Cr. Rem. on Levit. 26. 16.

Ib. *Agues*—דלקת. Although it be not eaſy to aſcertain what particular diſeaſe is meant by this word, I am very much inclined to think it is *the ague*. The Septuagint have ῥιγει, and Vulg. *frigore*. Moſt of the other tranſlators, indeed, have words that denote rather the contrary; and the nine other places in which the word occurs ſeem favourable to that meaning. But this is by no means againſt its being the *ague*; which may be diſtinguiſhed by its *hot* as well as *cold* fit. What induces me to believe it to be the *ague*, beſide the authority of Sep. and Saadias, (who expreſsly calls it חמי אלרבע, *a quartan fever*,) is, that an Ethiopic word

of the ſame origin denotes *to tremble*; and another derived from it *an earthquake.* See Ludolph's Lexicon, or Caſtell.—In Arab. alſo דלק denotes *reſtleſſneſs, commotion,* &c.

Ib. *Inflammations*—חרחר—Sep. ερεθισμῳ—Vulg. *ardore*—and ſo equivalently Syr. Perſ. and Gr. Ven. which has *καυσωνι.* Roſenmüller has *no doubt* of its being *a catarrhous ſuffocation*; "nomen habens a *ronchiſſando.*" The word חרחר, *harhar,* or *harhur,* has certainly a ſound not badly expreſſing ſuch a ſuffocation: but ſounds are uncertain criteria of genuine *etyma:* and in no other place find we this idea in the root חרר. I cannot better finiſh this remark than in the words of Dathe: "Qui morbi in lingua Latina, aut Germanica (adde Anglica) "his nominibus morborum Hebraicis reſpondeant, nemo tuto dixerit. Conjecturæ ex verborum "origine petitæ incertæ ſunt."

The three remaining maladies are not more certain. The firſt, חרב, which I render *droughts,* is by others rendered *the ſword:* and ſo it ſeems to have been underſtood by Sep. who have φονῳ*. So certainly Gr. Ven. εν ξιφει; and ſo equivalently the Thargums, Syr. and Perſ. But Vulg. has *æſtu,* and both Arabs and the Sam. verſion have equivalent terms†. I prefer this meaning, becauſe the word is here claſſed with other calamities which affect the fruits of the earth, namely,

Blights and mildews—שדפון and ירקון; the former of which terms is by Sep. rendered ανεμοφθορια‡—by Vulg. *aere corrupto,* a literal verſion of Sep.—Onk. Syr. and Perſ. have alſo ſimilar terms.—Perhaps it is to be underſtood of the wind called the *ſamiel* or *ſmum.* I could find no Engliſh term ſo proper as *blight.*

The other term, ירקון, by Sep. τῃ ωχρᾳ, and by Gr. Ven. ωχροτητι, is moſt probably what we call *mildew.* Jerom has *rubigine*—Onk. ירקונא, which is only the Heb. word Chaldaized.

Ver. 24. *Until ye be deſtroyed*—עד השמדך. So the preſent text: but Sam. has עד השמידך, followed by Sep. and Syr.—There is in this verſe an addition in Sep. και ἑως αν απολεσῃ σε εν ταχει: but the laſt two words are wanting in Ald. Comp. Alex. Ox. and Glaſg. Nor are they in the old Ital. quoted by Jerom. Yet they were read by the Coptic tranſlator.

Ver. 27. *The ulcers of Egypt.* That ſpecies of leproſy called the *elephantiaſis* was, if we believe Lucretius and Pliny, peculiar to Egypt:

> "Eſt elephas morbus, qui propter flumina Nili
> "Gignitur Ægypto in mediâ, neque præterea uſquam." *Lucret.* vi. 1112.

Ib. *The piles*—עפלים. The Septuagint conſidered עפלים not as a different malady from the foregoing, but its ſeat. They ſeem to have read בעפלים, without the copulative; as they read the comma thus: Παταξαι σε Κυριος ἑλκει Αιγυπτιῳ εις την ἑδραν§—but all the other ant. tranſlators read ובעפלים in their copies; although they underſtood the word differently.—Sym. τα κρυπτα—Vulg. *parte corporis, per quam ſtercora egeruntur*—Onk. בטחורין—Tharg. בטחוריא—Syr. בטחורא—Saad. אלבוסיר—all words that denote ſome malady affecting the *anus*—Gr. Ven. more explicitly ἀιμορροισει.—I believe it to be *the piles.*

* The word is wanting in the Roman edition. † Onkelos has a word as ambiguous as the Hebrew, without points: it may ſignify either a *ſword* or *aridity.* ‡ It is remarkable that Gr. Ven. has the very ſame word.

§ Some copies have εν ταις ἑδραις. If any copy have και εν ταις ἑδραις, it has been probably accommodated to the Hebrew.

Ib.

Ib. *With ſcabs and with itches*—בגרב ובחרס—Sep. ψωρᾳ αγρια και κνηφῃ—Vulg. *ſcabie et prurigine*—and ſo equivalently, or nearly equivalently, all the verſions—Gr. Ven. εν τε ψωρᾳ κᾳὶ οσροκιῳ.

Ver. 35. This verſe contains a genuine deſcription of the *elephantiaſis*. See Schilling *De Lepra*, p. 184. or Roſenmüller's *ſcholium* on the place.

Ver. 38. *For the locuſts ſhall devour it.* The Heb. word which I render *devour* is חסל, which, as a verb, occurs only here; but its meaning is pretty clear from the context, and is moreover aſcertained by the ſiſter dialects. See the Chald. and Sam. חסל.

Ver. 42. *The blight.* The Heb. word is הצלצל, commonly rendered *the locuſt*: and ſome have ventured to define it to be *gryllus ſtridulus* Linnæi; and that its very name *tſelatſal* imports as much. Moſt of the antient verſions favour ſome ſuch meaning: yet I am inclined to think that צלצל is not an animal, but a particular ſort of blight that principally affects trees. I have therefore followed Sep. and Vulg. the former of which have ἡ ερισυβη *; the latter *rubigo*.

Ver. 57. *Secundines*—שלית—Sep. το χοριον †—Gr. Ven. ὐςεροις—Vulg. *illuvie ſecundarum*: and ſo equivalently the other verſions: yet I am not ſure, but that שלית is the *embryo* itſelf, and not its envelope.

Ver. 68. *Ye ſhall there be ſold as ſlaves*, &c. Blackwall renders thus: "Ye ſhall be ſet "to ſale; and no one ſhall buy you."—Law: "Ye ſhall offer yourſelves to be ſold," &c.—and the Heb. will bear ſuch a rendering.—Thoſe who conſider this menace as a prophecy refer it to the time of Titus and of Hadrian. The former ſent 17,000 adult Jews into Egypt, to be there employed in hard labour; and ordered thoſe under ſeventeen years to be ſold to the beſt bidder. In the reign of Hadrian a very great number of Jews were ſold in the ſame manner at Rahel's ſepulchre. See Joſeph. De Bell. Jud. iv. 9. and Jerom on the 31ſt chapter of Jeremiah.

CHAP. XXIX.

IN our common verſion, and indeed in all the verſions in the Polyglott, the firſt verſe of this chapter is wrongly disjoined from the preceding chapter; to which it evidently belongs; and ſhould be noted ver. 69. as it is in the firſt editions of the Hebrew text, followed by Kennicott.—I have reſtored the verſe to its proper place; but mark it, in the margin, as belonging to chap. 29. for the ſake of reference.

Ver. 5. *I have conducted you*—אולך אתכם—*ambulare feci vos*. So the preſent text, and ſo the Sam.‡ But the Septuagint read in the third perſon, ηγαγεν; and ſo Jerom, *adduxit*; and Syr. דבר. And, I confeſs, this reading ſeems to ſuit the context better than the other.

Ver. 6. *Bread ye have not eaten*, &c. This muſt not be too ſtrictly and literally underſtood.

* Suidas, indeed, ſays that the word means alſo a little animal which is born in the fruit and deſtroys it: θηριδιον τι εν τῳ σιτῳ γενομενον—but he adds that ſome conſider it only as a malady that harbours in the ſeeds, and corrupts the fruit: τινες νοσον επιγινομενον τοις σπερμασιν, ὁ λυμαινεται τον καρπον. † Το χοριον μεν συνεςηκεν εκ δυο φλεβων και δυο αρτηριων, και πεμτου του καλουμενου ουραχου, ητοι επειδη χωρημα ες̄ι του εμβρυου, οιονει χοριον, η επειδη χορηγει την τροφην αυτῳ. Hippocr. Defin. Med. It is alſo written χωριον. ‡ Wrongly marked in my Var. Read. for Sep.

They

They were not altogether deſtitute of bread, or of wine; both which were uſed in their ſacrifices: but that bread and that wine muſt have been purchaſed from ſtrangers, as they had no corn-fields or vineyards of their own, during their nomadical life in the wilderneſs.

Ver. 18. *Venom and wormwood*—ראש ולענה. Inſtead of ראש five MSS. have רוש, and a ſixth had at firſt the ſame reading; which, in the elder editions, was the textual reading in ch. 32. 32. and which I am apt to think is the true original reading.—But what is the preciſe meaning of רוש or ראש, it is not eaſy to determine.—The antients render variouſly. Sep. χολη—Vulg. *fel.*—So equivalently Syr.—Onk. and the Thargums uſe general metaphorical terms.—Both Arabs. and Perſ. have alſo general terms, but denoting *venom*—Gr. Ven. τιθυμαλλον; a ſpecies of ſea-lettuce; which, according to Columella, is, with ſalt, good for recent wounds. Celſius takes it to be *hemlock*. I am inclined to think it is *rue:* but as this is mere conjecture; and as in other places it ſeems to denote *poiſon*, I have in my verſion adopted that general term.

With regard to the next word, לענה, it is rendered by Sep. αποψια, and by Vulg. *amaritudine:* but moſt of the other interpreters have *wormwood*. The words "this day," in the firſt colon of this verſe, are wanting in all the copies of Sep. that I have yet ſeen: perhaps σημερον may be found in ſome of Holmes's MSS.

Ver. 19. *So as to gratify every appetite*—למען ספות הרוה את הצמאה. How variouſly theſe words have been explained, the reader may ſee in Pole. I ſhall here give only the principal antient verſions, with one or two of modern critics: Sep. ἱνα μη συναπολεσῃ ὁ ἁμαρτωλος τον ανα-μαρτητον: a ſtrange verſion indeed, if they read as we now do.—Vulg. *et abſumat ebria ſitientem:* equally unintelligible.—Onk. בדיל לאוספא ליה חטאי שלותא על זדנותא—"ſo that to his ſins "of ignorance be added ſins of pride:" an evident paraphraſe, but founded, I think, on the literal meaning. The Thargums give a ſimilar explanation.—Syr. ונוסף רויותא על צחיותא: quite literally—and ſo equivalently the Sam. verſion, Perſ. and Gr. Ven. which agrees with our common verſion, "*ſo as* to add drunkenneſs to thirſt."—Le Clerc, followed by Dathe, ſupplies the word *earth*; and renders, *ut addat irrigationem terræ ſitienti*; to which he gives a figurative meaning, which is juſtly rejected by Roſenmüller*.—Roſenmüller himſelf is pleaſed with Michaëlis's interpretation: "ut abſumet (*radix illa noxia* ver. preced.) terram irriguam et ſiti-"culoſam †."—I think, with Houbigant, that the Syriac tranſlator has well and literally rendered the words; and that their metaphorical meaning is what I have given in my verſion.—Delgado gives a different and ingenious, but leſs natural, explication ‡.

Ver. 27. The words which I have included in a parentheſis could not well be pronounced by the Iſraelite, in whoſe mouth this ſpeech is put; unleſs he had then before him a volume of the law. I would therefore conſider them as an incidental explanation of Moſes himſelf; as if

* "Tunc *terra ſitiens*, per metaphoram, eſſet *animus* Iſraelitarum, deſiderium idololatriæ fovens; et *cogitationes illæ*, "quas ſub hujus verſus initio legimus, ſuaves iis et optatæ, eſſent *irrigatio terræ ſitientis!*" † This interpretation, however, he has not followed in his German tranſlation; which is, "wenn er gleick nach ſeinen egenen gedanken und "willkür handelt."—Both interpretations are, in my opinion, unwarrantable. ‡ His verſion is: "to add the "well watered ground to the thirſty." That is (ſays he) "*to add* the crimes committed through wantonneſs aud pride "to thoſe committed when [one is] led by a ſtrong deſire, not being able to ſubdue the paſſions .... as, when David "brought Uriah's wife to his bed, it was a crime which he could ſcarcely withſtand: but when he cauſed the death of "Uriah, it was a great addition to his crime."

he

he had ſaid, "meaning thoſe maledictions, which are written in this book, or volume.—Sep. ſeem to have read in their copy בספר התורה הזאת: εν τῳ βιβλιῳ του νομου τουτου.

Ver. 29. Is by Sep. rendered thus: τα κρυπτα Κυριῳ τῳ Θεῳ ἡμων* τα δε φανερα ἡμιν (al. ὑμιν) και τοις τεκνοις ἡμων (al. ὑμων) εις τον αιωνα. κ. τ. λ.—by Vulg. *abſcondita, Domino Deo noſtro: quæ manifeſta ſunt, nobis et filiis noſtris uſque in ſempiternum*, &c.: as unintelligible as the Doway verſion: "things hidden to our Lord God, which are manifeſt, to us and to our children for "ever," &c. Nor, indeed, is any verſion that I have ſeen, either antient or modern, in my apprehenſion, ſatisfactory. I have therefore riſked one of my own; which perhaps, to others, will appear as unſatisfactory as former ones to me. The meaning, I think, is: "The chaſtiſe-"ments which we now undergo, are a manifeſtation of the ſecret deſigns of the Lord againſt "us, in caſe we ſhould in any age ceaſe to obſerve his laws." And this inclines me to believe that they are the concluſion of the anſwer to the queries in ver. 24. rather than a reſumption by Moſes. I add, below, the verſions of Houbigant, Michaëlis, and Dathe†.

CHAP. XXX.

I HAVE nothing to add to my Explanatory Notes on this chapter; ſave that in

Ver. 10. The addition from Sep. *και τας κρισεις αυτου*, is wanting in Comp. but it is in all the other editions and MSS. that I have ſeen; and in the Coptic verſion.

CHAP. XXXI.

THE reader will be pleaſed to obſerve, that I have in my verſion tranſpoſed verſes 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, and 23, to the end of the preceding chapter, to which they ſeem evidently to belong; and where they come in much more naturally than in their preſent order; as any one may convince himſelf, by comparing my tranſlation with the common one.—I proceed to remark on ſome difficult paſſages.

Ver. 9 and 10. It is the remark of Roſenmüller, that *the law* here enjoined to be read every ſeventh year before the people, *at the feſtival of booths*, muſt be reſtricted to the Deuteronomy: for how, in the ſpace of ſeven days, could the whole Pentateuch be read?—I think it ought to be reſtricted to ſtill narrower bounds; that is, from the 44th verſe of chap. v. to the end of chap. xxx.

Ver. 19. *This ſong*; that is, the ſong or ode afterward recorded in chap. xxxii. Jeruſalem's

* So Rom. with Comp. and Alex. But Ald. Ox. and Glaſg. have ὑμων—But all the other verſions read as the Heb.; and Copt. muſt have in his Gr. copy read ἡμων. † Houb. *Quæ apud Dominum [Deum] noſtrum abſcondita ſunt, nobis ea filiisque noſtris palam facta ſunt ad multas ætates*, propterea, &c.—Mich. "Die verborgen ſukunft gehört "für Jehova unſer Gott: das bekannt gemachte aber iſt für uns, und unſer nachkommen zu ewigen ſeiten," &c.—Dathe: *Occulta, Jovæ Dei noſtri ſunt: revelata autem ad nos et poſteros noſtros pertinent in perpetuum*," &c.—The following remark is from Abp. Secker's MS. Notes: "The Sam. *thau* being very like the Sam. *aleph*, I take והנגלאו (the "Sam. lection) to be a mere corruption from והנגלות, only written fully—נגלו would ſuit Houbigant's tranſlation: but "the ſame purpoſe may be anſwered by a ſmaller change; reading והגלת, and rejecting the prefix; which might come "from repeating the laſt letter of the preceding word. Then the ſenſe will be: 'The things which are (or were) hid "with God he hath revealed,' &c. and thus the connection will be better, but the conſtruction not ſo."

fancy,

fancy, that under *this ſong* is comprehended the whole book of Deuteronomy, appears to me a wild fancy. It was ſuch a ſong as might be "taught the children of Iſrael, and put into "their mouths," as a conſtant teſtimony againſt them, if they ſhould tranſgreſs the precepts of the Lord.

Ver. 28. *The heads and elders*, &c. The preſent text has only elders, זקני: but ſeveral MSS. have ראשי inſtead of זקני, and one has both; which, I doubt not, was the original reading followed by Sep. τους φιλαρχους ὑμων, και τους πρεσβυτερους ὑμων. See the note below.

Ib *In their hearing*. So both texts and all the verſions. But 12 Heb. MSS. have באזניכם, *in auribus veſtris*; and 6 Chald. MSS. have an equivalent reading. The Syr. verſion has alſo לכון, *vobis*; and Saad. in Pol. has a ſimilar reading, אכלמכם, *I will ſpeak to them*; but the edition of Conſtantinople, in Heb. characters, has אכלמהם. See De Roſſi.

CHAP. XXXII.

THE very beautiful ode, contained in this chapter, has exerciſed the critical talents of many learned moderns—Vitringa, Le Clerc, Houbigant, Lowth, Kennicott, Green, Michaëlis, Dathe; the laſt of whom has more happily laboured on the ſubject, in a particular Diſſertation, firſt printed at Leipſic in 1768; and reprinted in his *Opuſcula*, edited by Roſenmüller in 1796. Of the labours of all thoſe, and of others, I have availed myſelf; but have ſometimes taken the liberty to differ from them all, when I thought I had reaſon. Theſe differences it muſt be my chief endeavour to explain, and defend, in the following Remarks; which, however, I ſhall make as ſhort as poſſible; and without pointing out the many particular beauties of the compoſition; which every reader of taſte muſt rather feel than ſee.

Ver. 1. *Liſten, ye heavens, while I ſpeak*, &c. So the ſublime Iſaiah: *Hear, ye heavens**, &c. The reader needs not be told, that this addreſs to the Heavens and the Earth acquires a peculiar propriety from its being made in the open air.

Ver. 2. *May my doctrine drop as the rain*—יערף כמטר לקחי. The word יערף is variouſly rendered—Sep. προσδοκασθω; by which they are, by ſome critics, ſuppoſed to expreſs a verbal ſignification of ערף, *the neck*; as if the meaning were *to expect with outſtretched necks*: and as if Moſes ſaid: Let my doctrine be expected with the ſame deſire that a ſalutary ſhower is expected. This, I confeſs, is but a ſorry interpretation.—Vulg. *concreſcat*; for which Schulz is at a loſs to conjecture what word was read in his original. But I think he read the ſame word as we do; and took it in a ſignification which it ſtill has in Arabic; *to be thick, to thicken*, &c.—Onk. and Tharg. Jeruſ. have words that denote *ſweet*, יבסם; as if they had read in their copies יערב: and the Perſic tranſlator appears to have had the ſame idea.—But Syr. both Arabs, and Gr. Ven. have words denoting *to drop, diſtil*, or the like. The laſt, I think, has wonderfully well rendered the comma: Σταξατω ὡς ομβρος το ρημμα μου.

* In like manner Æneas in Virgil:

"Eſto nunc Sol teſtis, et hæc mihi Terra vocanti." *Æn.* xii. 176.

And Latinus:

Suſpiciens cœlum, tendensque ad ſidera dextram;
Hæc eadem, Ænea, Terram, mare, ſidera juro. Ibid. 196.

Ver. 3.

Ver. 3. *For in the name of the Lord I addreſs you.* I have here ventured to differ, I believe, from almoſt all, if not from all interpreters; who make this comma a part of ver. 3. and the beginning of the following hymn: whereas I am convinced it belongs to ver. 2. and is the natural concluſion of the prelude. Indeed, the preſent diviſion has always appeared to me abſurd: for, what fine illation is this: "Becauſe I will publiſh the name of the Lord, *therefore* "aſcribe ye greatneſs unto our God *!" But join the *becauſe* to what precedes, and all is clear and conſecutive.—But let us analyſe the text; of which we have two readings. The preſent Heb. is כי שם יהוה אקרא: but Sam. כי בשם יהוה אקרא—followed by Syr. and Saad. and even by the Erpenian Arab. who is generally a cloſe imitator of the preſent Heb.—and this I take to be the genuine reading; although I am of opinion that the other reading admits the ſame meaning. But what is the meaning? I think it clear from the context, that the true meaning is what I have given in my verſion. Moſes atteſts the heavens and the earth to liſten to what he is going to ſay, and wiſhes that his ſpeech be like a penetrating rain, and a reviving dew.—Why? Becauſe he is going to ſpeak "in the name of the Lord." So Iſaiah, after a ſimilar atteſtation: כי יהוה דבר—"becauſe 'tis the Lord who ſpeaketh."—If the antient tranſlations be properly pointed, they will corroborate my interpretation. For example, let the Septuagint be given from an unpointed MS. thus: Προσδοκασθω ὡς ὑετος το αποφθεγμα μου και καταβητω ὡς δροσος τα ρηματα μου ὡσει ομβρος επ' αγρωσιν και ὡσει νιφετος επι χορτον ὁτι το ονομα Κυριου εκαλεσα δοτε μεγασωσυνην τῳ Θεῳ ἡμων κ. τ. λ. Who would not ſuppoſe that ὁτι το ονομα Κυριου εκαλεσα belonged to what precedes, and not to what follows; and accordingly point after εκαλεσα?—The editor of Saadias has been equally unjuſt in the diviſion of his author's text; which, when properly divided, well expreſſes the meaning of the original. Reſtore לאי אדעוכם באסם אללא to ver. 2. and point after אללא; and ſee if the ſenſe be not better, and the context more conſiſtent.—Some modern critics have endeavoured to do away the inconſiſtency by rendering כי not *becauſe*; but *when*, or *while*; and giving to אקרא the meaning of *celebrabo*. So Houbigant: *Dum nomen Domini celebrabo, tribuite Deo noſtro gloriam.* And ſo our Green: "While "I am proclaiming the name of Jehovah, do ye aſcribe greatneſs to our God."—Michaëlis, neglecting the כי entirely, makes the comma an unconnected ſentence, belonging neither to ver. 2. nor ver. 1. "Jehovens namen will ich beſingen."—Dathe and Roſenmüller retain the illative, but inſulate the comma "Nomen *enim* Jehovæ celebrabo:" but why then did not they connect this with ver. 2.?—In ſhort, I have no doubt of the comma's belonging to what precedes; and that כי cannot here be properly tranſlated by any other Engliſh word but *becauſe* or *for*.—On caſually caſting my eye on Purver's verſion, ſince writing the above, I find that he has not badly rendered the paſſage: "for it is the name of the Lord that I proclaim." I wonder this did not lead him to put a full point inſtead of a colon after *proclaim*.

Ver. 4. *The creator.* Heb. הצור, written in the common Maſoretic copies with a gigantic *tſadé*: a pure Rabbinical conceit. In 100 of Kennicott's MSS. the letter is no taller than its neighbours; and, no doubt, many of De Roſſi's MSS. had the ſame orthography; although he has not noticed them.—With reſpect to the meaning, צור commonly ſignifies *a rock*; and ſo it

* I here uſe our common verſion. Coverdale has: "For I will call upon the name of the Lord: give ye the glory "unto our God."—Bate: For I will declare the name of Jehovah: aſcribe ye greatneſs to our Aleim."

is literally rendered by Gr. Ven. ὁ λιθος. The other verſions metaphraſe variouſly—Sep. Θεος * —and after them Vulg. *Dei perfecta ſunt opera*—Onk. and Syr. have תקיפא, *ſtrong*; and the latter joins the word to ver. 3. not improperly.—Saadias follows the ſame arrangement, and renders אלהואלק *the creator*; which is alſo the term uſed by Arab. Erp.—This, indeed, I take to be here the true meaning; for צור, not only in Heb. but more particularly in Chald. and Syr. ſignifies *to form, to frame*, and conſequently *to create*. This agrees perfectly with what follows: God is THE CREATOR, κατ' ἐξοχην, whoſe works are all perfect.—Volney fancied (and an odd fancy it is) that הצור is the Ægyptian *Oſiris!*

Ver. 5. *Yet corrupted are his own degenerate children.* "It has been thought impoſſible (ſays "Dr. Kennicott) to give any regular conſtruction to the firſt part of this verſe, as it now ſtands "in the Heb. text: and it is therefore happy, that the Sam. Pentateuch and the Gr. and Syr. "verſions diſcover two tranſpoſitions in the preſent Heb. and agree to expreſs this ſenſe: *They* "*are corrupted, not his; children of pollution,*" &c. This obſervation, borrowed from Houbigant, is partly juſt.—But let us ſee the ſtate of the text, and its various interpretations. The preſent Heb. runs thus†: שחת לו לא בניו מומם—by Montanus rendered, *corrupit ſibi, non filii ejus, macula eorum*; which who can underſtand, may: for I do not.—Nor indeed is the original, as it here ſtands, to me intelligible; and which our Engliſh tranſlators‡ did well to abandon. Our laſt vulgar verſion is: "They have corrupted themſelves; their ſpot *is* not *the ſpot* of his "children:" but in the margin: Heb. *He hath corrupted to himſelf*, that they are *not his children*, that is, *their blot:* nearly as intelligible as the verſion of Montanus.—It would be uſeleſs to rehearſe all the attempts that have been made to make ſenſe of this colon; I ſhall only mention one or two more. Delgado corrects our common verſion thus: "Did he de-"ſtroy them wantonly? No; their ſpot is of his children"—that is, ſays he in a note, *the blame lieth on themſelves who are his children.*—Dathe, after Lowth and Green§, takes מום to be the nom. of שחת, and renders, *Corrupit illi filios, non jam ſuos, ipſorum protervitas.* He owns, however, that the Samaritan lection gives a more obvious, and perhaps (adds he) the genuine meaning. The Sam. reading is: שחתו לא לו בני מום, without any manuſcript variety of lection: by Houbigant, who adopts it, rendered, *Corrupti ſunt, non ſunt ejus, filii maculæ.* In favour of all, or at leaſt a part, of this reading, are moſt of the ant. verſions. The Septuagint literally, Ἡμαρτοσαν, ουκ αυτῳ, τεκνα μωμητα: in the old Ital. rendered, *Peccaverunt, non ei, filii maculati.* —Aquila and Sym. ſeem alſo to have read שחתו, but they follow the order of the preſent Heb. in the two next words, לו לא; and the former read בנוי in his copy. Their verſions are: Aq. Διεφθειραν αυτῳ ουχ οἱ ὑιοι αυτου—Sym. Διεφθειραν τοκος αυτον ουχ ὑιοι το συνολον—Jerom alſo read בניו, and found לו before לא—*Peccaverunt ei, non filii ejus*, &c.—Of the other verſions, Onk. Tharg. Syr. Arab. Erp. and Perſ. appear to have read שחתו in their copies; and moſt of them לא לו:

* In 2 Sam. 22. 32. they render the ſame word κτιστης. And Maſius ſays that Theodotion, here, rendered πλαστης: but I find no ſuch reading in Montfaucon. † The various readings are theſe: 2 Sam. MSS. have שחית—1 has לו לא upon a raſure—in 1 אל is wanting—and 1 had, at firſt, בנים for בניו. All theſe are in Kennicott's collation.—De Roſſi has, unaccountably, taken no notice of the paſſage. ‡ Down from Coverdale to James's reviſers, with ſome variety in the mode of expreſſion—Even Purver here imitates them: "Theſe corrupt themſelves; unlike his "children, they have ſtains"—But Bate: "Corruption is on them: their ſpot *is* not his children's." § "Their "own depravity hath corrupted his children."—He rejects, with Hare and Grey, one of the negatives; as the *metre* (that is, the Harian metre) admits but one.

although

although they differ in rendering the whole comma. What Saadias ſaw, it is not eaſy to ſay: but he read שחת in the ſing. He read alſo לו לא: but how he found באוליאיה (*in amicos ejus*) in the Heb. words מומם בניו, I cannot poſſibly conceive.—The Greek of Venice is a very literal verſion of the preſent Hebrew text; ſave that its author ſeems to have read מומו inſtead of מומם. Εφθειρεν αυτῳ, ουχ' υἱεις αυτε, μωμος αυτῳ *.

After an attentive inſpection and compariſon of all theſe verſions, and of the readings of both texts, I am apt to think that the true reading ought to be made out of both; namely, שחתו לו' לא בניו' מומם. My reaſons for preferring this mixt reading are, 1. The nominative to the verb cannot, I think, be any other than בני, or בניו: to make אל, from the preceding verſe, the nominative is abſurd, not to ſay impious. 2. Beſides that all the ant. interpreters, ſave Sep. read בניו, the phraſe בני מומם, or even בני מום, ſeems to me uncouth and unwarranted; and, if the reading לו לא be the true one, as it appears to be, it would involve a contradiction. For the colon muſt be rendered thus: "They have corrupted themſelves, in his (God's) regard; "they are *not* children of blemiſh:" whereas it is evident from the context that they are *blemiſhed*. The only objection which, I foreſee, can be made to my arrangement, is, that מומם ſtands inſulated, as it were, from the reſt of the ſentence. But a paſſage in Proverbs will, I preſume, here help me out. It is in chap. 9. 7. which in the original runs thus: יסר לץ לקח לו קלון ומוכיח לרשע מומו; where מומו is in the ſame inſulated ſtate as מומם is here.—Whether this will ſatisfy future critics, I know not; but it is the beſt I have to give.—In my verſion, I have given what I deemed the *ſentential*, not the *verbal*, meaning of my original: a meaning which, every reader muſt allow, perfectly correſponds with the context.

Ver. 8. Here is another difficult paſſage, that has very variouſly been interpreted. Our common verſion is: "When the Moſt High divided to the nations their inheritance, when he "ſeparated the ſons of Adam, he ſet the bounds of the people according to the number of the "children of Iſrael." That is (ſays Patrick), "He made ſuch a diſtribution to other people "(particularly to the ſeven nations of Canaan) within ſuch bounds and limits, as that there "might be ſufficient room for ſo numerous a people as the Iſraelites, when they came to take "poſſeſſion of the country †."—The author of *Commentaries and Eſſays* juſtly rejects this interpretation; and thinks that "the paſſage would be clear and intelligible, if we were to under-"ſtand עמים to refer, not to the *Gentiles*, but to the people of Iſrael. The meaning (ſays he) "would then be, that when God, by his providential diſpoſition of things, ſeparated mankind "into different nations, and appointed them their inheritance, he did then, in his foreknow-"ledge, ſettle the bounds of the Hebrew people; according to the number of the ſons of "Jacob: i. e. according to their twelve tribes. He then determined to divide the land among "them, and in proportion to each tribe; which appointment he had now revealed to them "very particularly (ſee Num. xxxiv.), and thus had ſhown his peculiar regard to Iſrael, becauſe "he had choſen them for his own portion and inheritance." To ſupport this not unſpecious interpretation, he ſhows, what cannot be doubted, that עמים "is often uſed to denote a ſingle "people, and the people of Iſrael in particular ‡."—But the queſtion here is not, what עמים

* I was in the hopes of finding in Morell's corrections, at the end of the volume, that *αυτων* was the reading of the MS. but I looked for it in vain: yet I think the Greek tranſlator muſt have written *αυτων*. † This is yet a very common explanation; followed by Schulz, Dathe, Roſenmüller, &c. ‡ More properly, the collective tribes of a people.

may ſometimes ſignify; but what it ſignifies in this context: and I am clearly of opinion that it cannot have that ſignification which by this author is aſſigned to it.—But before I come to explain what I take to be the true meaning of the paſſage, let us ſee how it has been rendered by the antients; firſt exhibiting the original: בהנחיל עליון גוים בהפרידו בני אדם יצב גבלות עמים למספר בני ישראל: by Montanus, in his ſcrupulous and ridiculous manner, rendered, *In hæreditare faciendo excelſus gentes, in ſeparare faciendo eum filios hominis, ſtatuit terminos populorum ad numerum filiorum Iſrael*—Sep. Ὁτε διεμεριζεν ὁ ὑψιϛος εθνη, ὡς διεσπειρεν υἱους Αδαμ, εϛησεν ὁριᾳ εθνων κατα αριθμον αγγελων Θεου. Their verſion is ſingular only in this, that inſtead of בני ישראל, *the ſons of Iſrael*, they ſeem to have read בני אל, *the ſons of God*; which in other places they render ἀγγελοι, *angels*. Gale thinks that, writing at Alexandria, they changed *the ſons of Iſrael* into *the angels of God*; not to give offence to the Egyptians*. It has been ſuppoſed that in the Heb. copy which they uſed, the three firſt letters of ישראל had been omitted by the ſcribe, and אל only left: and this may poſſibly have been the caſe—although I hardly think it probable. However that be, all the other verſions read as we do at preſent—Vulg. *conſtituit terminos populorum juxta numerum filiorum Iſrael*—So equivalently Onk. Tharg. Syr. Saad. Erp. Sam. ver. Perſ. and Gr. Ven. whoſe literal verſion is, εϛησεν ὁρους λεων εις αριθμον των υἱεων τϑ Ισραελϑ.—But, notwithſtanding this uniformity of rendering, it is hard to make a connective and intelligible meaning out of ſuch a tranſlation. Hence, Houbigant imagined that a tranſpoſition had been made in the text, and would thus reſtore it: יצב גבולת עמים' חלק יהוה יעקב חבל' נחלתו ישראל' כי חלק יהוה עמו למספר בני ישראל: *Conſtituit terminos populorum: pars Domini fuit Jacob, funis hæreditatis ejus Iſrael; quando partitus eſt Dominus populum ſuum, juxta numerum filiorum Iſrael.* But this is certainly a moſt unnatural, and in my opinion an unwarrantable, arrangement. Let us then ſtick to the preſent order, as it is in the Sam. copy, followed by the Septuagint; and try if we cannot make a more natural and conſiſtent verſion than has yet been given. The Sam. lection is:

בהנחיל עליון גוים' בהפרידו בני אדם'
יצב גבולות עמים למספר בני ישראל·
כי חלק יהוה עמו יעקב' חבל נחלתו ישראל.

Which I have endeavoured to render as literally as poſſible in an intelligible verſion; but which Montanus would, in his barbarous Latin, render thus: "In hæreditare faciendo Excelſus "gentes, in ſeparare faciendo eum filios hominis (vel Adami) ſtatuit terminos populorum "præter numerum filiorum Iſrael: Quia pars Domini populus ejus Jacob, funiculus hæredi- "tatis ejus Iſrael."—The learned reader will readily ſee that this verſion ariſes chiefly from giving to the word למספר a meaning almoſt contrary to that which is commonly aſcribed to it; but which to me appears to be highly unſuitable. To juſtify mine own verſion, let it be obſerved, that the prepoſition ל has a great variety of meanings; and among others, that of *ab* and *præter*. Now any of theſe will here ſerve my turn; and give a conſiſtency to the reaſon-

* "Credo eos dediſſe aliquod auribus Ægyptiorum, quorum opinionem de diviſione antiqua confirmare viderentur. "Simul et invidiam declinabant, docendo iſtam diviſionem factam non *juxta numerum filiorum Iſrael*, quod Ægyptii "haud commode admiſiſſent, *ſed juxta numerum angelorum*, quod multo honeſtius ſonaret." Gale, Notæ in Jamblich. p. 279. It is more probable that they had in view a common Jewiſh tradition, that God, in the diviſion of the world, had aſſigned to each nation a particular guardian angel.

ing

ing of Moſes, which it has not as it is commonly rendered. For, what ſort of conection is this: "God divided the nations according to the number of the ſons of Iſrael, becauſe Iſrael is "his own portion," &c. ?—But give to למספר the meaning which I think it here has, and ſee the conſequence. "When God firſt divided the nations, he aſſigned to each particular poſ- "ſeſſions, *except* to the children of Iſrael: becauſe theſe, in due time, he meant to make his "own proper inheritance." Compare the whole context with ch. 26. 5. and ſay if this interpretation be not highly plauſible.—Indeed, if it be denied that למספר can admit his meaning, I would prefer the tranſlation of Sep. which gives at leaſt an intelligible, conſiſtent meaning, although it be founded perhaps on a falſe ſuppoſition; namely, that God, in dividing the nations, aſſigned to each a particular angel; but had reſerved for his own particular ſuperintendance and care his peculiar people Iſrael. That this idea prevailed among the Jews after the Babyloniſh captivity ſeems evident from the book called Eccleſiaſticus, in which a manifeſt alluſion is made to this very paſſage of Deuteronomy: "He appointed a ruler, ηγουμενον, for "every people, when he divided the nations of the earth: but he choſe Iſrael as a peculiar "people to himſelf," &c. Ecclus. 17. 15, 16.—Nay, I think it more than probable (with Theodoret, Jerom, and moſt of the antient fathers) that "the prince of the kingdom of Perſia," in Daniel 10. 13. שר מלכות פרס, is no other than the tutelar angel of Perſia. See Crit. Rem. on that place. The reading of Sep. then is far from being an improbable reading: at leaſt, it is perfectly conſiſtent with the context: whereas, if למספר be rendered "according to the number," and not, as I have rendered, "excluſive of the number," I confeſs I think the preſent Heb. reading irreconcileable.

In ver. 9. I have had no heſitation in admitting into the text the addition "Iſrael," which is not only in the Sam. copies, but alſo in Sep. The paralleliſm ſeems to require it.

Ver. 10. *He provided for them in the wilderneſs.* The preſent Heb. has ימצאהו, *He found him*, &c. But this is not true: he did not *find* them in the wilderneſs, but *brought* them into the wilderneſs*. The Sam. reading, יאמצהו, is therefore preferable; unleſs we give to מצא a different meaning, which perhaps it admits, namely, *to find for one*; as we might ſay; that is, to provide for his neceſſities. Compare the Chald. and Syr. מצא and the Sam. מצה. The Septuagint have well rendered αυταρκησεν αυτον εν τη ερημω: and ſo equivalently Onk. and Saad.

In the arid deſerts he fed them. I have here again followed the Sam. lection, בתהללות ישמנהו —*in locis arenoſis pinguiter* (i. e. *lautè*) *eos aluit.*—And ſo partly Sep. εν διψει καυματος εν γη ανυδρω.—The preſent Heb. has בתהו יליל ישמן, by our Engliſh tranſlators rendered "in the "waſte howling wilderneſs:" that is, ſays the Bab. Targ. a place "where dæmons and dra- "gons howl."—דמיילין שדין וויורדין. The other ant. interpreters ſeem to have gueſſed at ſome general vague meaning: nor is it certain how they read in their Heb. copies; except Gr. Ven. who gives this literal verſion: εν εςερημενη ολοφυρμω φρουδη.—I have no doubt of the reading of

* Roſenmüller's argument in favour of the preſent reading ſeems to me a weak one: "Poetice hoc expreſſum; quia "poëta, omiſſis pluribus ſæculis, ſtatim ad ea tempora tranſit, quibus Iſraelitæ, Nomadum more, Arabiam deſertam per- "errarunt. Igitur non quærendum quomodo dici poteſt Deus *inveniſſe* populum ſuum in deſerto, in quod eum ipſe "duxerat? Poëtam hic legimus, non ſcriptorem hiſtoricum."—Much is allowed to poets, to be ſure—

Sed non, ut placidis coëant immitia; non, ut
Serpentes avibus geminentur, tigribus agni.

Sam.

Sam. being the true one. It was followed by Houbigant and Dathe; whoſe verſion is, *In locis aridis lautè eum aluit.*—I ſubjoin his ſenſible obſervation: "Verbum lectionis Sam. ישמנהו benè "reſpondet verbo prioris membri יאמצהו; atque Moſes infra ver. 15. idem verbum, in eodem "ſenſu, de Iſraelitis adhibuit: *pinguis factus eſt Iſrael.*"

Ver. 13. *Honey*—דבש—Sep. and Gr. Ven. μελι; and ſo equivalently moſt of the other verſions: but the true meaning, I believe, is that given in the Bab. Thargum: אוניק יתהון דובשא מפירהא דמתרביין על כיפין, *he nurſed them with honey of his own fruits that grow on the rocks.*—I have little doubt of its being palm-honey*.

Ver. 14. *He made them drink.* The preſent text has תשתה—by our tranſlators rendered *thou didſt drink:* but all antient verſions ſeem to have read either שתה or ישתה; or conſidered the 2d perſon here as a Hebraiſm, which ſhould be rendered in the third perſon. But I believe the true reading to be either השתהו or השקהו, as the Syr. tranſlator ſeems to have read; and whom I have followed in my verſion.

Ver. 15. *Jacob ate, and was ſatiated.* Who does not ſee, that this addition, which is in the Sam. copies and in Sep. is a beautiful part of the paralleliſm?

Ib. *Iſrael grew fat.* The Hebrew word is ישורן, commonly pronounced *jeſhurun*; more properly *iſhurun:* which by Sep. is rendered ὁ ηγαπημενος—by Vulg. *dilectus*—by Saad. אלמוצוף, *laudatus*—and by Arab. Erp. אליהודי, a word of the ſame meaning—But Onk. Tharg. Syr. and Perſ. have all *Iſrael.* But whether they read ſo in their Heb. copies, or changed ישרון into a word which they deemed equivalent, it is hard to ſay; although (there being here no difference between the Heb. and Sam. copies) the latter ſuppoſition is the more probable.—But why did Moſes here uſe an uncommon term to expreſs the Iſraelitic people? and what is its meaning? Its meaning is by ſome lexicographers thought to be *plane rectus*, i. e. *rectiſſimus*; which the Septuagint and Jerom thought equivalent to *beloved.* But I am inclined to think, with Pagninus, Mercerus, and Grotius, that it is only a diminutive of *Iſrael*; and here uſed by the writer for the ſake of his metre, or perhaps as a more tender epithet for a delicate and pampered people; as the Latins ſaid, *animula, bellulus.* The Greek tranſlator of Venice ſeems ſo to have underſtood it, and employs a very proper term to expreſs its meaning, Ισραελισκος †.

Ver. 24. *With bitter deſtruction*—וקטב מריריי—by Sep. rendered και οπισθοτονος ανιατος—The other verſions vary. I think Jerom has well rendered the comma, *devorabunt eos aves morſu amariſſimo.* Some moderns, referring the word קטב to the Arab. ſignification *cuſpis*, render *ſagitta amara*, i. e. ſay they, *the peſtilence.* So Dathe: *abſumpti ab avibus rapacibus et peſte virulentâ.* But we muſt not omit attending to the Sam. reading: קטף, without the prefix; which is alſo the reading of 9 or 10 Heb. MSS. but with the prefix; and which is rendered in Pole *decerpet*; but which ſhould, I think, be rendered ſubſtantively *decerptio:* and this was probably the reading which Jerom had before him.—What the Septuagint read, or ſaw in their reading, it is impoſſible to ſay. The word which they uſe, οπισθοτονος, is ſuppoſed to be *a retorted tenſion* of the muſcles of the neck. Pliny ſays, in general, that any *dolor inflexibilis* was

* In the iſland of Madagaſcar there is a ſpecies of palm-tree called the *raven*; under the membranous covering of the flowers of which is found a gummy ſubſtance of an exquiſite taſte, which one would take for honey.

† Roſenmüller thinks that the meaning of *jeſhurun* is to be ſought in the Arab. ישרי, which, among other ſignifications, has that of *happy*.

ſo

ſo called: and Heſychius defines it *εναντιον κυρτωμα*.—For the reſt, Michaëlis has ſufficiently ſhown that רשף, in the firſt part of this comma, ſignifies *a bird of prey:* and its being put in company with *wild beaſts*, and *reptiles*, which immediately follow, evidently leads to that meaning.

Ver. 26. *I will extirpate them*—אפאיהם—Sep. *διασπειρω αυτους*—and ſo equivalently all the verſions ſave Onk. Vulg. and Syr. who all read with Sam. אפי הם in two words, although they differ in rendering אפי. The two latter render *ubinam ſunt? where are they?*—but Onk. *mine anger ſhall reſt on them:*—and the Lat. tranſlator of Sam. conſidered אפי in the ſame ſenſe, *ira mea ſunt:* but the Sam. reading will bear to be rendered as Vulg. perhaps more properly.

Ver. 27. *The enemy*—אויב—and ſo all the verſions; but the Sam. copy has איבי, *mine enemy*.

Ib. Sam. inſtead of "their adverſaries," צרימו, has צרינו—Sep. ſeem to have read only צרי, without the affix: and Onk. perhaps read only צר.

Ver. 35. *For a day of vengeance.* I follow the Sam. reading, ליום נקם, which is alſo that of Sep. *εν ἡμερᾳ εκδικησεως*. The preſent Heb. has לי נקם, *mihi vindicta*; or as Vulg. *mea eſt ultio:* and ſo equivalently the other verſions: but the לעת, in the laſt member of the verſe, ſeems decidedly in favour of the Sam. lection.

Ib. *And retribution*—ושלם—So both texts, without any various reading, ſave that one of Kennicott's MSS. has ושלים, *plenè*.—But Sep. ſeem to have read אשלם, *ανταποδωσω*; and ſo it is quoted in the New Teſtament more than once. Nay, Onk. Tharg. Syr. Vulg. and even Gr. Ven. appear all to have had before them the ſame reading: but both Arabs. and Perſ. read ושלם, and conſidered שלם as a noun; but a noun in concordance. I am perſuaded that it is a noun in regimen; and that the whole verſe is intimately connected with the preceding one.

Ver. 37. *Where* now (*will he ſay*) *are your gods?*—ויאמר אי אלהימו; a Hebraiſm for אלהיכם. Comp. ver. 38. where the laſt two pronouns are in the ſecond perſon.—The Sam. copy has here ואמרו, in the plural; as if the words were the words of the enemies of Iſrael; and ſo they were underſtood by Saadias, although he read in the ſingular.—But Sep. either read, or ſupplied, יהוה after אמר: *και ειπε* Κυριος: and there is no doubt of this being the proper ſupplement.

Ver. 42. The laſt comma of this verſe has, I think, been generally miſunderſtood and miſinterpreted. The verſion of Sep. is *απο κεφαλης αρχοντων εχθρων* *—Vulg. *nudati inimicorum capitis* †—Onk. מריש סנאה ובעיל־דבבא—and ſo equivalently Tharg. Bab. Syr. Arab. Erp. and Perſ. —Saadias, מן רוס פראענה אלאעדא, *from the heads of rebellious enemies*. This variety of rendering the word פרעות ſhows, that its real meaning is hard to be aſcertained. Hence the moderns are not leſs divided than the antients ‡. I have endeavoured to fix its original ſignification in another place §:—in the ſuppoſition that I have fixed it right, let us ſee what conſiſtent ſenſe will ariſe out of the whole comma. In the firſt place, it is evident that the poet intended a paralleliſm: hence Houbigant conjectured, that the firſt two commas of the verſe had ſhifted places, and that a ſlight alteration had taken place in the comma now in queſtion. Inſtead of

* The ſame idea ſeems to have occurred to the Jeruſalem Thargumiſt. † So Gr. Ven. *απο του κεφαλη αποκαλυπτειν εχθρου*. ‡ The greater part of modern interpreters give to it the ſignification of *vengeance*. So our common Engliſh verſion: "from the beginning of revenges upon the enemy." So Purver: "from the firſt revenge "on the enemy." But Bate: "for all the injuries of the enemy." Our earlier Engliſh verſions may be ſeen in Cruden's edition; commonly called Biſhop Wilſon's Bible. § Remarks on the Song of Debora.

מראש he reads משאר, and forms his verſion thus: *Gladius meus hauriet carnes; ſagittis meis ſanguine inebriabo; ſanguine interfectorum et captivorum; carne impii et inimici.* This conjecture is acknowledged by Schulz to be a probable one: to me it appears in a different light.—Green finds an *hyperbaton* in the verſe, and tranſpoſes thus: "I will make mine arrows drunk "with blook, with the blood of the ſlain and of the captives: and my ſword ſhall devour "fleſh from the hairy head of the enemy."—I ſee no need for either altering or tranſpoſing the text, which is the ſame in all the copies, and was read by all the antients: but then I think בשר is evidently to be underſtood before מראש; by which the paralleliſm is complete; and more beautiful, in my opinion, in its hyperbatic form, than by any tranſpoſition that could be made. See my verſion.

Ver. 43. There is in Sep. a ſingular addition at the beginning of this verſe: Ευφρανθητε ουρανοι αμα αυτω, και προσκυνησατωσαν αυτω παντες αγγελοι Θεου· the firſt comma of which is quoted by Paul, Rom. 15. 10; the laſt by the author of the Epiſtle to the Hebrews i. 6. Yet there is not a veſtige of either in the Heb. and Sam. texts, nor in any other antient verſion.

Ib. *Rejoice, thou nation, his people*—הרנינו גוים עמו; without any variety of reading, ſave that one, perhaps two MSS. have את before עמו. The comma, however, has been variouſly rendered. Sep. ευφρανθητε εθνη μετα του λαου αυτου: followed by our laſt tranſlators: "Rejoice, O ye "nations, *with* his people*!" But our more early verſions, following the Latin Vulgate, have: "Praiſe, ye heathen, his people!" or, "Ye nations, praiſe his people!" And a ſimilar rendering is placed in the margin of our vulgar verſion.—Vulg. *Laudate, gentes, populum ejus!* followed by Pagninus, the Tigurines, Geneva, Bruccioli, De Valera, Caſtalio, Le Clerc, Houbigant, Dathe, &c.—And ſo equivalently the antient interpreters, Onk. Syr. Saad. and Perſ. are made to ſpeak in their Latin verſions. But I am convinced theſe verſions are erroneous; and that their originals ſhould be rendered, not *Laudate, gentes, populum ejus!* but *Canite, gentes, populus ejus!* as the Bab. Tharg. has very properly paraphraſed: הרנינו שבחו אומיא עמיה בית ישראל: *Rejoice and ſing, ye peoples, his own people, the houſe of Iſrael!*—So alſo Aquila and Theodotion: αινοποιησατε εθνη, λαος αυτου—αγαλλιασθε εθνη, λαος αυτου—and ſtill more explicitly, and better, Gr. Ven. αλαλαξετε εθνη, λεως υι.—This meaning did not eſcape the ſagacious Luther, who has well expreſſed the meaning: "Jauchzet alle, die ihr ſein volk ſeid"—Michaëlis: "Heiden, die ihr ſein volk ſeyd, freuet euch"—and Roſenmüller: *Gentes*, quæ nunc eſtis *ejus populus.*—Not badly Purver: "Sing, O nations, you his people!"—More literally the Spaniſh of Ferrara; "Cantad, gentes, ſu pueblo!"—I have no doubt of this being the genuine meaning. That גוים, although a plural, is applicable to the ſingle people of Iſrael, is clear from Ezek. 2. 3. which the reader is requeſted to inſpect.—There is here in Sep. another addition; και ενισχυσατωσαν αυτω παντες υιοι Θεου: ſo Comp. Rom. and Alex.† but Ald. ſeveral MSS. and the Coptic verſion have αγγελοι Θεου.

Ib. *The land of his own people.* So the Sam. text, אדמת עמו: and ſo Sep. την γην του λαου αυτου—and Vulg. *terræ populi ſui.* The preſent Heb. has אדמתו עמו, by our Engliſh tranſlators rendered, "unto his land *and* to his people." And Onk. Syr. both Arabs. Perſ. ſeem to have ſo read in their copies; unleſs perhaps a *vau* have been dropt out of the text; which may have

* Junius, Diodati, the Dutch, Le Cene, Le Gros, have all ſimilar verſions.

† Wrongly marked by Bos among the copies which have αγγελοι.

have been אדמתו ועמו.—But Gr. Ven. clearly read as we do at preſent, having τη γη αυτου του λεω αυτου. I think the Sam. lection preferable.

CHAP. XXXIII.

THERE are great beauties in this chapter, and moſt ſublime paſſages; but there are, at the ſame time, many difficulties to encounter, in properly rendering them. That I have overcome them all, it would be preſumption to affirm: I can only ſay, that I have done my beſt.

Ver. 2. preſents a beautiful metaphor, drawn from the progreſſive motion and effects of the ſun*. The laſt colon has been variouſly underſtood, and I think generally miſinterpreted. The Heb. is: ואתה מרבבות קדש מימינו אש דת למו; by Montanus rendered: *et venit a decem millibus ſanctitatis: a dextra ejus ignis lex eis*; and by our Engliſh tranſlators: "and he came with "ten thouſands of ſaints: from his right hand *went* a fiery law for them:" which verſion whoever underſtands muſt have a wonderful comprehenſion. And yet, ſtrange to ſay, not one of the antient verſions is much more intelligible: as the curious reader may convince himſelf by turning to his Polyglott. I ſhall here content myſelf with giving the verſion of the Septuagint, and that of Jerom, becauſe the former is ſingular in the rendering of ſome words, and both, with reſpect to another word, confirm the Sam. lection; of which preſently.—Sep. συν μυριασι Καδης, εκ δεξιων αυτου αγγελοι μετ' αυτου†. They conſidered קדש as a proper name; and took אש דת or אשדת to be a metaphorical expreſſion for *angels*.—Vulg. *Et cum eo ſanctorum millia. In dextera ejus lex ignea.* It is clear that they both followed the Sam. reading, אתו; and ſo did Onk. and Syr.: but all of them, I think, miſtook the meaning of it, conſidering it as a compound of את and ו: whereas I believe it to be the third perſon plural of the verb אתה.—The other tranſlators, who had the preſent Heb. before them, alſo conſidered אתה as a verb: but, at a loſs to find a nominative for it, they refer it to the preceding יהוה, with which the ode begins. Hence their verſions are embarraſſed and incongruous. Take for example that of Gr. Ven. the moſt literal that can well be made: και αφιξεται τορος των μυριαδων του αγιου, εκ δεξιων αυτου τουρ νομου σφισιν.

As all theſe tranſlations are evidently forced and unnatural, modern criticiſm has long laboured to find more ſuitable interpretations; either by correcting the text itſelf, or by expiſcating new meanings for ſome particular words out of the text as it at preſent ſtands. Of the latter claſs of critics are our Durell and Green. The former makes קדש the nominative to אתה, and thinks it means here the *Holy-one*. He thinks רבבות means the houſe of Iſrael; and renders the firſt comma thus: "And the Holy-one came with multitudes." He then reads אשדות, in one word, with a great number of MSS. and renders the ſecond comma thus: "From his "right hand *iſſued* ſtreams to them." He means *ſtreams* of light.—Green makes the preceding יהוה the nom. to אתה, but, with Sep. makes קדש a proper name; and, ſupplying the pre-

* "Obſerva perpetuam metaphoram a ſole deſumptam, qui initio lucem præmittit, (בא) poſtea oritur ipſe, (זרח) "tandem terras illuſtrat, (הופיע) et totum cœlum percurrit, (אתה). Sic gradatim Deus præſentiam ſuam in populo "declaravit, quacunque iter fecit, inde a termino Ægypti, uſque ad fines Cananæos." Roſenmüller.—I think the laſt word (אתה) is miſplaced, and belongs not to the metaphor. † Houbigant fancied that, for theſe three words אש דת למו they read אשרי עמו, *legati* (i. e. *angeli*) *cum eo*—from the Chald. שרד, *mittere*.

poſition מ before it, he renders the firſt comma thus: "and marched with *his* ten thouſand "men from Kadeſh:" and the ſecond comma he renders: "Fire from his right hand was a "ſignal to them." That is (ſays he), Fire proceeding from the right hand of the cloud of glory was a ſignal to the Iſraelites, when to ſtrike their tents and march forward, and when to pitch again. He refers to a paſſage in Habakkuk 3. 5. "He had beams of light iſſuing from his "hand."—On the whole, a plauſible verſion, eſpecially if דת were certainly *a ſignal*; and in the ſuppoſition that אש דת, in two words, were the right reading, I ſhould be inclined to think that this is the true meaning: for, why not admit in this piece of poetry a Syriaſm, as well as a Chaldaiſm, which thoſe interpreters are obliged to do who render דת *an edict* or *law*?

Le Clerc makes אש the nominative to אתה, and joins the two commas thus: "Atque è "myriadibus ſanctis venit eis ignis, è dextra ejus:" a verſion juſtly derided by Houbigant; whoſe own verſion ſhall be examined by and by.

Dathe takes a ſingular method to explain his text. He conſtrues the word מימינו with קדש, and thinks that it means *to ſtand at one's right hand*, in order to protect one: "*ſtare ad dextram alicujus*, pro, adeſſe ad alicujus defenſionem." By רבבת קדש he ſuppoſes the Iſraelites to be deſignated; and thus renders the two commas: "Profectus eſt cum myriadibus lectiſ-"ſimi exercitûs, ad ejus defenſionem, columna nubis eis præivit."—This is certainly a ſtrange paraphraſe, which, I believe, has not been followed by any poſterior critic.

Roſenmüller will have רבבת קדש to be God's own heavenly reſidence, "ubi magna ange-"lorum cohors ipſi adſtat." His verſion is: *Venit a myriadibus ſanctis; a dextra ejus columna ignis eis.* But does דת ever mean *a pillar*, or *column*?—Lentz* has endeavoured to prove that it does: but his proofs, although deemed probable by Dathe, appear to me feeble and fallacious. He derives דת from ידה, *tendi, protendi:* whence *protenſio*, and whence *columna protenſa*. Who does not perceive that this is a forced derivation? Much better ſay with Green, that it is derived from דתא, which in Syr. ſignifies *a ſign*, and might without much ſtraining be applied to the cloudy *pillar* of the Pentateuch. But it is not at all probable, that Moſes would denominate that pillar by any other term than עמוד, which is ſo often uſed in Exodus and Numbers, and for which no other word is ever ſubſtituted.

Delgado, after Aben-ezrah, thinks that אש דת means *a conſtant fire*; and refers to the Chaldee for this ſignification: but although דת in Chaldee ſignifies *an edict, ſtatute, law*; it can ſignify *conſtant* only in a metaphorical ſenſe, in as far as laws are *ſtanding* edicts: and here ſuch a metaphor can hardly, I had almoſt ſaid cannot poſſibly, have place†.

Michaëlis, making one word of אשדת, gives us this rendering: "Begleitet von heiligen "heeren, und zu ſeiner rechten waſſergüſſe."

We come now to thoſe critics, who have attempted to give plauſible interpretations, by correcting the text. Among theſe the firſt is Houbigant. He juſtly obſerves that אש דת, even admitting the Chaldee ſignification of דת, cannot ſignify *a law of fire:* in order to make out that meaning, the words ſhould be tranſpoſed. But, independently of this (ſays he), if

* Obſervat. Miſcel. in Sylloge Diſſertationum, Leidæ 1775, p. 1010, 1011, 1012. † Yet this interpretation pleaſed Teller; who renders *ignem perpetuitatis*. See his Preface to his Latin verſion of Kennicott's Second Diſſertation, p. xv.

דת אש were the reading, "Quale erit iſtud *legis* attributum? Nunquam Moſes nec legem dixit "*igneam*, nec verbo דת utitur, ut ſignificet *legem*; et infra ver. 4. enuntiatur *lex* per verbum "תורה, adhiberi ſolitum."—Now for his own conjecture. He ſuppoſes, that the right reading of אש דת למו is השתדרים לו, *ſatagentes ei*; from the ſame Chaldee root from which he ſuppoſed the Septuagint derived their verſion.—Or (adds he) we may appeal to the Arabic תשדר, *agile, buſy*, "quod convenire angelis Deo aſtantibus nemo non videt."—To the objection that might be made to his having recourſe to *one* Chaldee term, after having rejected *another*, he anſwers: "Non ſunt iſta ſimilia: ſexienties venit *lex* Dei in Pentateucho nomine תורה, contra quam "nuſquam verbo דת, ne in libris quidem Eſdræ ac Nehemiæ, poſt Bab. captivitatem ſcriptis, "niſi ut ſignificetur edictum regis; non autem ut *lex* Dei." All this is well; but does not a ſimilar reaſoning hold good againſt his השתדרים? Where are God's angels, either before or after the captivity, called by that name? Houbigant himſelf, however, gives not here his conjectural emendation without ſome doubt. "Feliciorem conjecturam (ſays he) adhibebit, ſi "quis poterit."

Dr. Kennicott, finding in the Sam. verſion נור אורה, imagined that the original reading of the Heb. text was אש אור, and in his Firſt Diſſertation, p. 428, he formed his verſion accordingly. But, modeſtly admoniſhed by Teller, and illiberally reproved by the flippant French abbé De Villefroi *, he ſeems to have changed his mind: as in his poſthumous Remarks (p. 84.) he gives us the common verſion, "From his right hand *went* a fiery law for them."

It is now time to come to my own verſion, which, perhaps, will meet with the fate of thoſe of my predeceſſors; and be rejected by ſome future critic, to make way for his.—I change nothing in the text, but upon manuſcript authority. I indeed follow the Sam. copy, and arrange the text thus: ואתו מרבבות קדש׳ מימנו אשדות למו׳. We have not only the authority of Sam. for אתו, but of Sep. Vulg. Onk. Syr. who all muſt have found אתו, not אתה, or אתא, (which is the reading of ſeveral MSS.) in their Hebrew exemplars. I have more than once already remarked, that the ה and ו have been often interchanged, from their reſemblance in the antient alphabet.—In the next place, I read מרבבות, with Sam. and not leſs than 78 MSS.—Thirdly, I read מימנו, with Sam. and 1 MS.—Fourthly, I read אשדות, in one word, with Sam. and more than 50 MSS.—I reject אש דת, not merely becauſe דת is a Chaldee term; but, both becauſe it is a novel Chaldee term, and never uſed, not even here, by Onkelos or the Thargumiſts; and becauſe אש דת cannot with any grammatical propriety be rendered *a fiery law*. To reſume, then, in an inverſe order, אשדות can mean nothing elſe than *ſtreams* of water; particularly ſuch as iſſue from rocks or mountains. We have now a proper nominative to the verb אתו; and we have only to explore the meaning of מימנו and מרבבות. The learned and moſt ingenious Mr. Bradley thinks that מרבבות is the ſame with מריבה, מריבת, or מריבות; for ſo it is written in

* See his fourth Letter, p. 89 of the French edition; where the author, in diſplaying his ill-natured wit againſt Kennicott, betrays his own groſs ignorance of the ſubject on which he is treating. Witneſs what he ſays of the Sam. verſion, p. 92 and 93. "Le ſecond mot eſt נור (*naur*), qui ſignifie en Hebreu *une lanterne*, et dans le Chaldéen *du feu*. "Le troiſieme eſt אורה (*aura*), qui veut dire *lumiere*. Enfin le quatrieme eſt לון (*laun*), qui veut dire *loger!* en ſort "que réuniſſant ces quatre termes, je trouve que ce paſſage ſignifie: *Elle loge dans ſa main droite une lanterne, ou un feu "de lumiere.* La verſion Samaritaine nous a conſervé là une belle idée. Je vous en fais mon compliment, et encore plus "de la richeſſe de votre trouvaille." What petulant ignorance! The man did not know that לון in the Sam. dialect is the ſame with למו in Hebrew. The word in Sam. which correſponds with the Heb. לון *to lodge*, is בית.—Such is the ſtrength of this critical Hercules!

Ezek. 47. 19. and even joined with the ſame word קדש which follows it here. Hence he would make the two words the name of a place, and render: *From his right hand came ſtreams for them from Meriboth-Kedeſh*, or *Meriba-Kadeſh*. And this explanation once pleaſed Kennicott (1 Diſſert. p. 423.) and archbiſhop Secker (in his MS. notes). There are, however, two objections to it. Firſt, there wants the præpoſition מ. This indeed, it may be replied, may have been dropt, from its contiguity with the following מ: but this is, at leaſt, improbable: nor is there a veſtige to be found of it in any MS. or any of the antient verſions. Secondly, the word is uniformly written with a double *beth*: and ſo read all the antients, referring it not to רוב, from which the name of מריבה is derived, but to רבב. Suppoſe, then, this latter to be the root; רבבות, or רבבת, will denote *a copious quantity* of any thing; and more eſpecially *a copious quantity* of water. See the Arab. רבב.—All this granted, I am myſelf convinced that the true meaning of the words is what I have given in my verſion: "and from whoſe right hand came ſtreams "of water for them from the copious ſprings of Kadeſh."—I had almoſt forgotten to obſerve, that the Syr. tranſlator muſt have read in his copy not אשדת, as Secker conjectured; but either אשד or אשדה; miſtaking, as was eaſily done, a *thau* for an *he*: but ſtill he conſidered אשד as the radix of the word, as he renders it יהב.

This has been a long Remark: I ſhall try to be more brief in future.

Ver. 3. *O loving Father of the people!* The preſent text has אף חבב עמים—commonly rendered, "Yea, he loved the people"—by Green, "Doubtleſs, he loved his people." How frigid, when compared with the Sam. lection אב חובב עמים*, which, with Durell, I have followed in my verſion.—By עמים are evidently meant the tribes of Iſrael, as Onk. well renders: although Kennicott, after Houbigant, labours to prove that by עמים are meant the nations at large, and that the paſſage relates to the Meſſiah. His verſion is, "Truly he loveth the nations" —The Septuagint ſeem to have read עמיו or עמו: as they render του λαου αυτου.

Ver. 4. *The law which thou haſt enjoined to us.* In the preſent both Heb. and Sam. texts we read תורה צוה לנו משה—lit. *legem præcepit nobis Moſes*—or, as our vulgar verſion, "Moſes com- "manded us a law." But how ſuch a parentheſis could be pronounced by Moſes himſelf, it is not eaſy to conceive. If then it be not an interpolation, explanative of מדברתיך, I cannot ſee how it can accord with the context; unleſs the word משה, *Moſes*, be excluded. See Dr. Kennicott's Firſt Diſſertation on the State of the Hebrew Text, p. 434. The Doctor ſuppoſes that משה or מושה may have been inadvertently thruſt into the text, from its ſimilarity to the following word מורשה. I ſhould rather think that מורשה, or מרשה (which is the reading of 16 MSS.), was originally repeated in the text, and that we ſhould read תורה צוה לנו מורשה מורשה קהלת יעבוב: "He enjoined us a law for an inheritance, an inheritance of, or for, the "people of Jacob." This is quite in the Hebrew ſtyle; more emphatical in itſelf, and, I think, more agreeable to the nature of poetical compoſition. I need not warn the intelligent reader, that, in this whole ode, the 2d and 3d perſons are frequently interchanged, according to the idiom of the Hebrew language. I have uniformly rendered in the ſecond perſon, when the words of Moſes are immediately addreſſed to God.

Ver. 6. *Let Reuben live, and not die; although his men be but few in number.* The laſt member of this verſe in the original runs thus: וידי מתיו מספר. Inſtead of מתיו the Sam. copy has

* It is but fair to obſerve, however, that 6 Sam. MSS. have אף; and that probably all the antients ſo read in their copies.—For the reſt, 4 Heb. MSS. have חובב; and in another the ו ſeems to have been effaced.

has מאתו, which the Septuagint are ſuppoſed to have followed in their verſion, και εστω ωολυς εν αριθμω—Vulg. *et ſit parvus in numero*—"Ineptè, (ſays Dathe) quia tum eſſet imprecatio, non "bonum votum." Not ſo, if compared with the former comma. Only the ו ſhould in Latin have been rendered not *et*, but *ſed*. The benediction evidently alludes to the ſmall number of the Reubenites, compared with the other tribes. See my Explanatory Note.—Moſt of the verſions, however, give a different meaning to the comma; namely, "let his number be "great:" but this appears to me but ill to accord with the previous wiſh, "Let him live, and "not die:" which is evidently equivalent to *Let him not be entirely extinguiſhed*. In Iſa. 10. 19. מספר clearly ſignifies *a ſmall number:* and why מתי מספר ſhould not have a ſimilar meaning, I can ſee no good reaſon, if the context ſeem to require it *.—Le Clerc and Michaëlis, by pointing מתיו differently, make out this meaning: *ſint mortui ejus pauci*—"let his dead be few." And Gr. Ven. ſeems to have underſtood the word in the ſame ſenſe, τελεσοιαν δ' οι θνητοι οι αριθμος.—Still I think the other meaning preferable.

It is ſtrange that there is no mention made of Simeon, in either the Sam. or Heb. texts; nor in any of the verſions: ſave that ſome copies of Sep. have Συμεων between και and εστω†.—See Sabatier.

Ver. 7. *And bring him back*—תביאנו. But Sep. ſeem to have read תבוא, as they render ελθοις αν, or εισελθοις αν: if indeed either of theſe be their true reading. Ald. Compl. and perhaps ſome other copies have ελθοισαν‡, in one word; and in Montfaucon, this is ſaid to be alſo the rendering of Aquila: but this is clearly a miſtake. See Scharfenberg, p. 142.

Ver. 10. *Before thee*—באפך, or, as 20 MSS. באפיך, which, perhaps, is the better reading. The meaning is diſputed. By Sep. it is rendered εν οργη σου—So alſo Vulg. *in furore tuo*—and ſo equivalently Syr. both Thargums, and Gr. Ven. But Onk. both Arabs. and Perſ. have words that denote *before thee*, or *in thy preſence:* and this I believe to be the better rendering. The other is, however, plauſible; and may be referred to what is recorded in Numb. 16. 46. which ſee.

Ver. 11. *So that they may riſe no more*—מן יקומון—Sep. μη αναστητωσαν—Vulg. *non conſurgant*—and ſo the other verſions.—But Sam. has מי יקימנו.

Ver. 12. *May the* SUPREME *continually protect him.* The preſent Heb. has only חפף עליו כל יום §—by our Engliſh tranſlators rendered, "*and the Lord* ſhall cover him all the day long:" ſupplying the words in Italic. I am of opinion, with Dathe, Herder, and Roſenmüller, that the firſt עליו was originally עליון, and that it belongs to the following comma, עליון חופף עליו כל יום. So

* Houbigant thinks, that מתי has been dropt out after מתיו. † Roſenmüller and Dathe miſtake, in ſaying that this addition is only in Cod. Alex. It is alſo in Ald. and Comp. But it is wanting in Rom. and in Ambr. Canon. and Glaſg. MSS.; and is not only not quoted by the Greek fathers, but by ſome of them expreſsly ſaid to be wanting in the correct copies of Sep. Nor is it in the Coptic verſion.—We ſhall ſoon, it is to be hoped, ſee, whether any of Dr. Holmes's MSS. have it. ‡ The Canon. MS. reads thus: εισελθοισαν αι χειρες αυτου, και διακρινουσιν. κ. τ. λ. The Glaſg. MS. has a ſing. reading, ελθοιεν.—On the whole, ελθοις, or εισελθοις αν, is moſt probably the genuine reading. It was eaſy, as Nobilius remarks, for ελθοις αν to be run into one word, ελθοισαν: whereas, to make the latter the true reading, we muſt ſay that they read in their Heb. copy, not תבוא, but בואו, or יבאו. § Three MSS. have חופף; and Sam. has והופף. The firſt עליו is wanting in Sam. and the ſecond עליו in 4 Heb. MSS. Dathe adds, that the antient interpreters omit it alſo. But this is a miſtake. It was read by them all. But Syr. with Sam. omits the firſt עליו. See the Polyglott. Gr. Ven. has moſt literally πειποιθοτως επ' αυτου, σκεπων επ' αυτου κ. τ. λ.

equivalently

equivalently Sep. ὁ Θεὸς σκιαζει επ' αυτῳ πασας τας ἡμερας. "Quæ lectio (ſays Dathe) valde "probabilis videtur. Primo enim hoc עליו non admittit explicationem, quoniam ſubjectum non "eſt Jova, ſed Benjamin dilectus Jovæ. Deinde, tria membra ſibi melius reſpondent."—I am, however, inclined to think that, by following the Sam. reading, another probable rendering may be given; namely, "May the beloved of the Lord reſt in ſecurity; and may he (the Lord) be "his protector at all times*!"

Ib. *And dwell between his ſhoulders*—ובין כתפיו שכן—Sep. και εναμεσον των ωμων αυτου κατεπαυσει—Vulg. *et inter humeros illius requieſcet*—And ſo equivalently the other verſions; except Onk. and Tharg. who paraphraſe thus: *and in his land, or limits, ſhall the majeſty of the Lord reſide:* alluding no doubt to the temple of Jeruſalem; which was partly in the borders of Benjamin.—This idea has been embraced by Dathe and Roſenmüller: *et inter montes ejus conſideat* †.

Ver. 14. To what I have ſaid in Explanatory Note, I ſhall here only add Dathe's verſion, with Roſenmüller's ſhort ſcholium: "Propter fructus optimos qui gignuntur beneficio ſolis, "propter fructus optimos, qui ſingulis menſibus naſcuntur."—"Proventus ſolis (ſays Roſen-"müller) ſine dubio ſunt fructus qui ſemel tantum intra ſolarem periodum proveniunt, ut "vinum, triticum, hordeum: quibus opponuntur *protruſiones lunarum:* i. e. fructus qui plus "ſemel in anno, aliquot lunæ periodis colliguntur, ut fœnum, oliva, ficus, in Paleſtina, paucis "menſibus exceptis."

Ver. 19. *From treaſures hidden in the ſand*—שפני טמוני חול—Sep. εμπορια παραλιον κατοικουντων—But better Vulg. *et theſauros abſconditos arenarum.*—So Onk. and the other verſions, except Syr. which has *and ſhips hidden in the ſand:* if indeed אלפא here means *ſhips*, which I am inclined to doubt: why not *thouſands*; i. e. very great riches ‡?—which will accord with the *treaſures* of the other verſions.—Moſt literally, as uſual, Gr. Ven. κεκαλυμμενα κεκρυμμενα ψαμαθῳ.

Ver. 21. *Therefore he ſeeth*, &c. The preſent Heb. runs thus: וירא ראשית לו כי שם חלקת מחוקק ספון ויתא ראשי § עם צדקת יהוה עשה ומשפטיו עם ישראל—By our Engliſh tranſlators rendered: "and he provided the firſt part for himſelf, becauſe there, *in* a portion of the lawgiver, *was* "*he* ſeated; and he came with the heads of the people, he executed the juſtice of the Lord, "and his judgments with Iſrael."—Which if any one underſtand, he has a clearer intellect than mine. Indeed, it is, in my opinion, impoſſible to make ſenſe of the text as it ſtands. Hence the ſtrange diverſity among the ant. interpreters. Sep. και ειδεν απαρχην αυτου, ὁτι εκει εμερισθη γη αρχοντων συνηγμενων ἁμα αρχηγοις λαων κ. τ. λ.—Vulg. *Et vidit principatum ſuum, quod in parte ſua doctor eſſet repoſitus: qui fuit cum principibus populi*, &c.—Onkelos here wildly paraphraſes to this purport: "At the beginning he ſhall receive his portion; becauſe there, in his

* Durell, adopting the Sam. יד יד, inſtead of ידיד, renders the verſe thus: "The hand, *even* the hand of the Lord, "ſhall dwell in ſafety upon him: it covers him all the day long, and dwells upon his ſhoulders." Few critics, I think, will acquieſce in this verſion. † "Vox כתפים proprie ſunt *humeri:* hic autem poetice ita dicuntur *montes.* "Simili tranſlatione Hebræi dixerunt montes *gibboſos.* Intelliguntur montes Zion et Moria, qui ad tribum Benjamin "pertinebant." Roſenmuller in loc.—But Michaëlis follows the old track: "und wohnet auf ſeinem ſchultern."—Our Green renders: "and he ſhall dwell within his borders"—And ſo Bate. ‡ Unleſs perhaps *ſhips* may be ſaid to be hidden in the ſands, in as far as they are moored in low ſandy ſhores. § Sam. has העם; and there are ſome other various readings of little moment.

"inheritance,

" inheritance, Moſes, the great ſcribe and chief of Iſrael, was buried; and he went out and " went in before the people," &c.—Still wilder, but of the ſame nature, is the Thargum;—and not diſſimilar are the verſions of Syr. and Saadias.—Even Gr. Ven. is tinctured with the ſame notion; although he renders more literally: Ειδε δε τ'αρχην αυτω, καιγαρ εκει μερις τυπτοτου εστεγασμενου και εθραυσε κεφαλας λεω κ. τ. λ.

What modern critics have done to heal the ſore, will appear from ſome of their verſions, from Le Clerc downward.

Le Clerc. " Vidit ſibi primitias, qui illic parte legiſlatoris cohoneſtatus eſt; venit cum capi- " tibus populi," &c.

Houbigant. " Providit ſibi primitias, ubi partem a legiſlatore flagitavit, cum populi princi- " pibus," &c.

Dathe. " Primitias *terræ* promiſſæ ſibi expetiit, ibique in portione ſtatuta cum dignitate " vivet: ſed antea præcedet populum," &c.

Michaëlis. " Er ſicht ſchon einen anfang, denn hier iſt ein erbtheil, rechtmäſſig, und " beneidet: Voran vordem volk wird ergehen," &c.

Hezel. " Sicht nur einen anfang für ſich, dort aber noch ein land eines trügriſchen für- " ſten, komint unter die häupter des volks," &c.

Purver. " He alſo looks the firſt for himſelf, becauſe he is covered there *at* the part of the " lawgiver, and comes *with* the heads of the people," &c.

Bate. " And he ſhall provide a chief part for himſelf, for there ſhall be the ſway of a " ſtudded ſceptre, and he ſhall reſtrain the heads of the people," &c.

Durell. " For he provided the firſt part for himſelf: when there *in* the decreed portion *he* " *was* ſecured, then he went with the heads of the people," &c.

Green. " He hath provided a principal part for himſelf; for there was he ſettled in *his* " portion by the lawgiver. But he ſhall march with the heads of the people," &c.

It would be tedious to accumulate here all the arguments which theſe authors adduce in ſupport of their reſpective verſions. I ſhall content myſelf with thoſe of Dathe, as they are, in my opinion, the moſt plauſible of all. Here then is the eſſence of his note: " Liceat mihi " meam afferre conjecturam, et verſionem ſuprapoſitam explicare. Adverbium loci שם, *ibi*, " emollit, ut ſpero, duritiem ellipſeos præpoſitionis ב ante חלקת. Participium activum חוקק, " quod ex meo ſenſu paullo durius, vel de Moſe, vel de Gado, explicatur, ego paſſivè lego; et, " quoniam cum חלקת conſtruitur, in fæminino מְחֻקָּקָה, ne quem offendat enallage generis, " cujus tamen quamplurima exempla ſunt in lingua Hebræa. Tandem ספון, ex uſu hujus vocis " in ling. Chald. explico, et ad Gadum refero. Sic evito alteram enallagem generis, quæ ſtatu- " enda eſt, ſi ספון cum חלקת conſtruitur. Quod ſi quis illis generis enallagis non offenditur, " poſſunt etiam verba illa verti: *Ibi portio ſtatuta ei eſt*: ſ. *manet ſpectabilis*. Sic non opus " eſt ellipſi præpoſitionis ב." The only fault of this expoſition, adopted by Roſenmüller, is, that it is too ingenious; and makes poſtulates which will not be eaſily granted.

I will now riſk my emendation of the text, and my verſion made in conſequence. The emendation is a very ſmall one: it conſiſts, 1ſt, in withdrawing a ſingle letter from the beginning of one word, and adding it to the end of the preceding word. Inſtead of כי שם חלקת I read כי שמח לקת. I ſuſpect, indeed, that the original reading was כשמח לקת: but as there is no abſo-

lute

lute neceſſity for this alteration, I let כי ſtand as it is. I am alſo inclined to think that a מ has been dropt from the beginning of מחוקק: but neither is this addition neceſſary; for חוקק has the ſame meaning as מחוקק. See Jud. 5. 9. and Iſa. 22. 16. 2dly, The tranſpoſition of a ſingle letter being, as before, made, I take לקת to be the verb לקת, which, though not elſewhere uſed in Hebrew, has in Arabic the ſame ſignification with לקח; only is more emphatical, and here more properly uſed. Its meaning is *to receive immediately*, and without reſerve: which was exactly the caſe of the tribe of Gad; to whoſe name (*Lucky*) there is moſt probably an alluſion here intended. I might avail myſelf of the rules of criticiſm, and ſay that perhaps לקח was the original reading; and that the ח had been changed into a ת; a change moſt eaſily made: but I content myſelf with לקת as it is, in the meaning which I have juſt now mentioned. I next conſider ספן as a noun, as it is in 1 K. 6. 15.—7. 7.—in Jerem. 22. 14.—Hag. 1. 4.—and ספינה in Jonah is to be conſidered in the ſame ſenſe; that is, *a covering, a protection, a ſhelter*.—Theſe preliminaries granted, a literal verſion may be framed thus: "Ergo, vidit primam *por-*"*tionem* ſibi *datam:* cum lætus recipit a decernente tegmen: attamen ibit primus populi, "juſtitiam Domini faciens et judicia propter Iſraelem."—See my Engliſh verſion, and Explan. Notes, and compare Num. 32. 25, 34, 35, 36.

Ver. 23. For an account of the fertility of Galilee, where the tribes of Naphthali and Iſſachar had their inheritances, ſee Joſephus De Bell. Jud. lib. iii. c. 3. Pococke, Arvieux, Troilo, and other travellers in the Eaſt.

Ver. 27. The firſt part of this verſe has been wonderfully miſunderſtood and miſrendered. The words are: מענה אלהי קדם ומתחת †זרעת עולם*—by Sep. rendered *και σκεπασει σε θεου αρχη, και υπο ισχυν βραχιονων αιωναων*—Vulg. *Habitaculum ejus ſurſum, et ſubter brachia ſempiterna*—Onk. בשמי שמיא מעמרה דאלהן מן קדים ולתחת מדור אלהא דמלקדמין ובמימריה אתעביד עלמא—Syr. זרע עלמא—Saad. ודו אלעקל אלאלא אלאזלי ומן דונה מלוך אלעאלם—Arab. Erp. מוטן אלאלה אלאולי ומן תחת קוה אלעאלם—Gr. Ven. Χωρος θεου φθασεως, κατωθεν δε βραχιονες αιωνος.—Such a ſtrange diverſity of rendering ſeldom occurs: yet not one of them, I think, gives the meaning of the original.—Nor have modern interpreters been more happy. Houbigant, for מענה, reads מעלה; and, for זרועות, ערותו, with Sam. and thus renders: *Surſum habitat Deus æternus; erit deorſum fortitudo ejus ſempiterna.*—Durell takes the preceding *Jeſhurun* (or *Iſrael*) to be the antecedent to מעונה, and with Houbigant, following the Sam. reading זדעותו, renders thus: "*Thou art* the "habitation of the eternal God, and under his everlaſting arms."—Green ſuppoſes, that "the pronoun affix of the ſecond perſon has been dropt after מועגה, and that in the laſt period "the tranſcribers have changed the affix of the ſecond perſon into the third"—and then renders thus: "The eternal God is thy refuge, and his everlaſting arms thy ſupport."—Delgado thinks that מועגה is cloſely connected with the laſt word in the preceding verſe, and renders, "(*which is*) the habitation of the antient God, and underneath are the everlaſting arms."—I ſhall give yet three verſions more:—that of Dathe: "Perfugium *eſt* Deus antiquus, demittit "brachium æternum."—That of Michaëlis: "Wolken ſind ſie wohnung des uhrhalten Gottes, "und unten ſpürt man den ewigen arm."—That of Hezel: "Die wohnung des uralten Gottes; "darunter ſeine uralten arme."—If any one of all theſe verſions, antient or modern, ſatisfy the

* Read מעונה, with Sam. and 19 MSS. † Read זרועות, with 15 MSS.

critical

critical or uncritical reader, I am content; but they never could ſatisfy me. Our Bate alone, I think, though not often ſo happy, has here hit on the genuine meaning of his text.—*The Lord* is evidently the antecedent to מיענה, which is the participle active of ענה, *humiliare:* and מתחת is alſo the participle of the verb תחת, which, although it be not elſewhere uſed in Heb. is common in the Syr. and Æthiopic dialects, in the ſenſe of *ſubjicere, deprimere,* &c.—By אלהי קדם is not meant Jehovah the God of Iſrael, but the falſe gods of former times. Thus, the whole verſe makes a ſuitable and natural continuation of ver. 26; without any alteration in the text, or conſtraint in rendering it. See my verſion.

Ver. 29. *On their high places ye ſhall trample*—אתה על במתימו תדרך—Sep. *συ επι τον τραχηλον αυτων επιβησῃ*—Vulg. *tu eorum colla calcabis.* They underſtood במתי in a metaphorical ſenſe; and ſo do Onk. Tharg. Syr. both Arabs. and Perſ.* The Gr. of Venice has *επι των μετεωρων.* I have, with our vulgar verſion, Durell, and Green †, rendered literally *high-places*; as I think the word refers to the places of pagan worſhip. Dathe renders: "tu eorum terga calcabis:" approved by Roſenmüller: "alluditur (ſays he) ad morem orientalium antiquorum hoſtes de-"victos pedibus calcandi."—But Michaëlis and Hezel; "und du erſteigeſt ihre höhen"—"ſollſt du erſteigen ihre höh'n."

CHAP. XXXIV.

Ver. 1. *AND the Lord ſhowed him the whole land, from the river of Egypt to the great river Euphrates, and to the further ſea.* This is all that is in the Sam. copy: but all the verſions agree with the preſent Heb. and inſtead of the above general deſcription have what follows in my verſion from the mark || to the end of ver. 3. The words "and to the further ſea" are placed after "the land of Judah." See Var. Read. and Explan. Note.—For the reſt, it is not probable that this viſion was a real diſtinct viſion of all thoſe regions; but only an ideal indication of the limits of the land. Yet from the tops of ſome mountains one may ſee a far way. Volney tells us that "from an artificial mount in the centre of the city of Aleppo, one ſees to "the north the ſnowy tops of the mountains of Beilan; on the weſt, thoſe which ſeparate the "Orontes from the ſea; while, to the ſouth and eaſt, the eye can diſcern as far as the "Euphrates." But Volney is not always a ſure voucher.

Ver. 5. *So Moſes, the ſervant of the Lord, died,* &c. In deſpite of this expreſs account of the death of Moſes, not only many Jews, but ſome good Chriſtian fathers, think that he died not, but was ſnatched up to heaven alive! This, however, is not the common opinion of modern commentators, whether Chriſtians or Jews.—A queſtion here ariſes: Did Moſes write this account of his own death and ſepulture? Why not? (ſays Origen, after Joſephus and Philo) ſince he was a prophet! The Jews, in general, think otherwiſe: they believe that this whole chapter was written by Joſhuah. The opinion of Jerom, that it was written by Ezrah, is much more probable; although I would not poſitively affirm it. It is clear, however, that it muſt have been written after, and ſome conſiderable time after, Moſes; from this expreſſion, "unto this day no man knoweth aught of his ſepulchre!"

* The Perſic word is indeed rendered *excelſa* in the Polyglott: but it ſhould be rendered *excelſos,* in a metaphorical meaning: that is, *high in dignity:* בלנראני. † He renders "*fertile* hills."

Ver. 6. *And was buried*—יבקר אתו—*et ſepelivit eum.* Who? "God," ſay ſome commentators, "by the miniſtry of his angels:" and the apoſtle Jude ſeems to ſay that it was Michael, who was charged with that office*. Others think, that "he buried himſelf;" that is, he retired into ſome ſecret cave and there expired, as in his tomb. Others believe, more rationally, that he was privately interred by Joſhuah and Eleazar. I think the Hebrew verb is to be taken impersonally, as Hebrew verbs often muſt be; and that the French *On l'enſevela* is a juſt tranſlation: but, as we have no ſuch impersonals, we muſt render paſſively.

Ver. 7. *Nor his vigour gone*—ולא נס לחה †. Although the words themſelves ſeem clear, yet they have been ſtrangely rendered. Sep. *ουδε εφθαρησαν τα χελωνια αυτου*—Vulg. *nec dentes illius moti ſunt*—Onk. "nor was the beautiful ſplendour of his countenance changed"—Syr. "nor "were his cheeks wrinkled"—all from the purpoſe. The word לח ſignifies *greenneſs*, and metaphorically the *vigour* of life. The comma is well rendered by Saadias: לם תזל רטובתה—*non recederat viror ejus.* The Erpenian Arab has almoſt the ſame words.

The chapter concludes with a ſhort but high encomium of the Hebrew Legiſlator; not high enough, however, for his poſterior panegyriſts. The reader, who is curious to learn what the Rabbins ſay on this head, may turn to Munſter's commentary in the ſecond volume of the Sacred Critics, part ii. p. 283.

That the Hebrew Legiſlator was a great and a wiſe man, is clear, I think, from the whole tenour of his laws: but that all thoſe laws were immediate emanations of an unerring Spirit, is far from being inconteſtable, and is no part of my belief. Nay, the God of Moſes, JEHOVAH, *if* he really *be* ſuch as he is deſcribed in the Pentateuch, is not the God whom I adore; nor the God whom I could love. The GOD whom I adore and love is the FATHER of our LORD JESUS: his Father and our Father; the Father of mercies and GOD of all conſolation; who is no reſpecter of perſons; who hateth not Eſau and loveth Jacob; who viſiteth *not* the ſins of the father upon his children, even to the *firſt* generation; who willeth all men to be ſaved; who maketh his ſun to riſe on the bad and on the good, and ſendeth ſalutary rain on the juſt and on the unjuſt.—Such is the GOD, whom I adore and love: and his ſingularly beloved Son, JESUS, I, next to him, worſhip as his Meſſenger of ſalvation, and the only Legiſlator whoſe laws are perfect and divine.

As there is yet a blank leaf of this half ſheet, I add the following Latin lines; which were made in anſwer to a particular friend, who requeſted me to tell him, whether I thought Moſes to have been inſpired?

* Jude v. 9. † Three MSS. have לחה, which I take to be the true reading.

AD

AD AMICUM MEI AMANTISSIMUM J. D.

NUM fuerit MOSES cœleſti flamine motus?
Quæris... Reſponſum hoc habe, Amice, meum.
Motus erat certo cœleſti flamine Moſes;
Moti quo Teutas, Numa, Lycurgus erant.
Nempe omnes Sophiæ ſacro de fonte biberunt:
Hauſerunt largè Hi; largius Ille tamen.
Nec tamen Hunc ſemper latices hauſiſſe putato
Illimes; luteas non ſemel hauſit aquas.
Uni homini tantùm licuit deducere lymphas
Omnino puras... Ille homo CHRISTUS erat.
Ille etenim ſolus, divino Numine plenus,
Leges perfectas, jus ſine labe tulit.
Ergo, alii ſileant legum quicunque latores:
Mî JESUS CHRISTUS Legifer unus erit.
Ah! poſſem tantùm tua, CHRISTE, abſolvere dicta,
Tunc eſſent votis cuncta ſecunda meis.
Aſt TU, Nate Deo, qui cum PATRE omnia poſſis,
TU mihi ſperatam, SPES mea! TU fer opem.
Per TE conceſſo, cœleſti robore fultus,
Promptus ego tua veſtigia, CHRISTE, premam.
Nam tua calcanti veſtigia ſacra ſalutem
Es TU pollicitus... Sed tua verba manent.
"Me, me qui ſequitur, tenebris non ambulat," inquis:
En ego Te, poſſum quomodo, CHRISTE, ſequor.
Sis mihi TU Lumen; ſis ſemper clara Lucerna;
Sis certum Indicium, Dux ſimul atque viæ.
Te Duce, callis ego metuenda pericula ſpernam
Anguſti, et Tecum gnaviter aſtra petam.

FINIS.

REGIUS